Internati

Dr

A CRITICAL AND EXEGETICAL COMMENTARY

ON

THE BOOK OF JOB

BY

SAMUEL ROLLES DRIVER, D.D.

AND

GEORGE BUCHANAN GRAY, D.Litt.

VOLUME I

THE INTERNATIONAL CRITICAL COMMENTARY

A CRITICAL AND EXEGETICAL COMMENTARY

ON

THE BOOK OF JOB

TOGETHER WITH A NEW TRANSLATION

BY THE LATE

SAMUEL ROLLES DRIVER, D.D.

REGIUS PROFESSOR OF HEBREW AND CANON OF CHRIST CHURCH, OXFORD
HON. D.LITT., CAMBRIDGE AND DUBLIN; HON. D.D., GLASGOW AND ABERDEEN
FELLOW OF THE BRITISH ACADEMY

AND

GEORGE BUCHANAN GRAY, D.Litt.

PROFESSOR OF HEBREW AND OLD TESTAMENT EXEGESIS IN MANSFIELD COLLEGE
AND GRINFIELD LECTURER ON THE SEPTUAGINT OXFORD
HON. D.D., ABERDEEN

(IN TWO VOLUMES)

VOLUME I

NEW YORK
CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS
1921

PREFACE

SOME eighteen months before his death in February 1914, Dr. Driver began the actual writing of the volume on "Job" for the "International Critical Commentary." In the middle of January 1914, when the very serious nature of his illness had became evident, he wrote a short memorandum on the state of his MS, and suggestions for the completion of his work. In this he expressed a strong desire that I should complete what he was compelled to leave incomplete. The task, I knew at once, would be arduous and absorb much time; but not to undertake it, or to do less than my best to discharge it, would have been an ill return for all that I had long owed to the friendship and scholarship of Dr. Driver. The time involved has even exceeded my expectations, partly because what remained to be done proved so much more than appeared at first. Finding that the mass of material would be very great, and wishing that the publication of the commentary should not be unduly delayed, Dr. Driver had earlier invited Dr. A. H. McNeile to undertake the exegetical notes and the Introduction, and, under conditions with regard to the claims of other work, Dr. McNeile had consented. It was naturally my own very strong desire that this arrangement should stand, and at first Dr. McNeile agreed that it should, and indeed, in looking through the MS with a view to his own part of the work, added on the first chapters some brief notes which, duly initialed, have been retained. But later the claims of his other work became so pressing that he wished to withdraw from co-operating in this com-

mentary, and, though it was with the greatest regret, I could but acquiesce in his wish. Thus by far the greater part of the work, and the final responsibility for the whole of it, has fallen on me. Of the actual division of the work I will speak further.

In the memorandum to which I have alluded, Dr. Driver wrote: "I began this in Aug. 1912; and have completed the first draft of virtually all the philological notes, and revised them as far as about c. 14: I have also completed virtually the translation and (fairly completely) the exegetical notes on c. 3–9 and 40–41." When the material was handed to me, I found that it contained less of the translation than this might seem to imply: the translation consisted of a text of the RV. with the very extensive alterations placed on the margin; occasionally a choice between one or two renderings was left open for final judgement. These corrections of the RV. began with c. 3 and extended (with the exception of $19^{25\text{-}27}$) to c. 28, and again from 40^{15}–41^{34}. Of these parts, then, the translation in this volume is Dr. Driver's, except that (1) here and there I have modified certain renderings of the RV. left uncorrected, out of regard to other passages or express statements in the notes; (2) that I have exercised the final judgement as between alternative renderings; and (3) that I have throughout determined how the divisions into lines, distichs, and tristichs should be represented. The exegetical notes, which extended only, and that with very varying degrees of completeness, from 3^{2}–9^{10} and 40^{15}–41^{30}, were not in form for publication: in another part of the memorandum the instruction runs: "Such exegetical notes as I have written, he [the editor] can utilize, supplement, or amend, as he likes. I should naturally like the explanations, etc., of my *Job in the RV.* to be, as far as possible, adopted, but I do not make this a *sine qua non*." I have accordingly incorporated much of this material in the commentary on these parts of the text; to have distinguished it constantly from the additions and modifications required would have unduly

complicated the notes, but here and there, especially when my own judgement slightly differed (*e.g.* on 3^8), I have made use of inverted commas to indicate direct quotation. Broadly, however, it may be said of pp. 31–87 and 354–371 that the notes on individual verses, as distinct from the introductory and certain longer notes (*e.g.* on pp. 40 f., 77 f.), are very largely in substance and largely also in expression, Dr. Driver's. For the rest the commentary is mine, though in order to perpetuate Dr. Driver's point of view, I have frequently cited not only his *Book of Job in the Revised Version*, but also his *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*, and occasionally I have transferred to the commentary, as being more appropriate there, a passage from the philological notes, distinguishing this matter by adding "Dr."

With the philological notes I have adopted a different course. It was to these the greatest attention and the fullest revision had been given. It seemed desirable then (1) that they should to the fullest possible extent be reproduced and their authorship made clear; yet (2) that these notes should be as complete and homogeneous as possible. I have, therefore, while adding freely, perhaps to the extent of about a third of the whole, distinguished all my own additions in substance, except in cc. 1. 2. 32^{1-6} and 42^{7-17}, which are entirely mine, by placing them in square brackets; but I have not thought it necessary unduly to multiply these signs by using them for the filling in of obvious references left blank in the MS, nor to distinguish slight formal changes made in preparing the MS for press, or in proof. As mentioned in the passage already cited from the memorandum, cc. 1–14 had been more fully revised than the rest; some notes, or parts of notes, were still unwritten even in these earlier chapters, but the blank spaces in the MS were far more frequent in the later chapters, and unfortunately occurred where many of the most important or difficult passages, such as $19^{25f.}$, were concerned.

Final responsibility for the whole must, as I have said,

under the circumstances rest upon me; but with this proviso, the distribution of the work may be thus tabulated:

	TRANSLATION.	COMMENTARY.	PHILOLOGICAL NOTES.
Driver . .	3–28	3–9^{10} 40^{15}–41^{30} (in large part).	3–31, 32^{7}–42^{6} (except matter enclosed in square brackets).
Gray . . .	1. 2. 29–42; also 19^{25-27}.	1. 2. 9^{11}–40^{14}. 42 entire, and the rest in part.	1. 2. 32^{1-6} 42^{7-17} and, in the remainder, matter enclosed in square brackets.

For the Introduction I am entirely responsible.

The aim of the philological notes is indicated in these sentences of the memorandum: "On philological points I found there was a good deal to say, and I wished the philological basis of the commentary to be strong, and thought that many things deserved a fuller discussion than they generally received in the volumes of the *ICC*. Notes and explanations of the principal emendations of Du. and Be. ought also, I thought, to be given for the use of students (though I do not believe myself that 1 in 10 is necessary or probable),—sometimes also the conjectures of Bi. and others (though I content myself mostly with merely mentioning these from time to time, and do not polemize against them). . . . I have not thought it necessary to quote exhaustively authorities for renderings and readings: the principal recent ones seemed to me sufficient. Improbable conjectures I have also omitted (except sometimes those of Du. and Be^{K}). An emendation quoted at the end of a note is not intended to imply my acceptance of it." "In textual matters I generally find myself in agreement with Bu.; but I cannot adopt his view of the Elihu speeches. I intended to acknowledge generously in the Preface the great value and help which Be^{T} had been to me. But I cannot accept many of his

emendations; he seems to me often hypercritical and prosaic."

On account of the extent of and the importance attached to the philological notes, they are printed in the larger type, and in the American edition issued in a separate volume.

I need not repeat here much that I wrote in the Preface to *Isaiah* ; it applies, *mutatis mutandis*, to the present commentary; but in the matter of transliterations I may observe that owing to the circumstances under which the present volume has been prepared there remain, much to my regret, certain inconsistencies—the ק, for example, being sometimes transliterated ḳ, sometimes q; and similarly different abbreviations of some names and titles will be found to have been used; but I trust that neither the one inconsistency nor the other will occasion any practical inconvenience.

G. BUCHANAN GRAY.

CONTENTS

ADDENDA ET CORRIGENDA.

Translation and Commentary.

P. 87. *For* "the chambers of the south" in 9[9], F. Perles (in *Orient. Studien Fritz Hommel . . . gewidmet* (1918), ii. 132) *suggests* "the (stars) surrounding the south," after the rendering of ὁ Ἑβρ. in the Hexapla—*καὶ πάντα τὰ ἄστρα τὰ κυκλοῦντα νότον* = חֹוְרֵי תֵמָן.

PRINCIPAL ABBREVIATIONS EMPLOYED

1. TEXTS AND VERSIONS.

'A, Aq. . . .	Aquila.
AVm. . . .	Authorised Version (margin).
EV(V). . . .	English Version(s).
MS(S) Ken., de Rossi	Hebrew Manuscripts as cited in Kennicott or De Rossi.
Oc., Or(ient). .	Occidental (Palestinian) and Oriental (Babylonian), see G-K. *7h* n.; and for the readings of the two schools in Job, S. Baer, *Liber Jobi* (1875), pp. 56–58.
OT. . . .	Old Testament.
PBV. . . .	Prayer Book Version.
RVm. . . .	Revised Version (margin).
Σ, Symm. . .	Symmachus.
Θ, Theod. . .	Theodotion.
𝔊	The ancient Greek (LXX) Version of the OT. (ed. Swete, Cambridge, 1887–1894). The readings of the codices are, when necessary, distinguished thus:—$𝔊^{A}$ $𝔊^{B}$ (Alexandrian, Vatican, etc.). For the cursives, reference has been made to *Vet. Test. Græce, cum variis lectionibus*, ed. R. Holmes et J. Parsons (Oxon. 1823), which is cited as HP followed by a numeral denoting the cursive. Editions of Job contain much that is really Θ (see Introd. §§ 48–51): such matter is commonly cited as 𝔊 (Θ).
𝔐	The Hebrew (unvocalized) text, *i.e.* the consonants of the ordinary Hebrew MSS and printed Bibles.
$𝔐^{1}$. . . .	The consonants of the traditional Hebrew text (𝔐) irrespective of the present word divisions and after the removal of the vowel consonants (cp. *Isaiah*, p. xxv).
𝔖	The Coptic (Sahidic) Version of 𝔊 (§ 48).
𝔏	Old Latin Version of 𝔊.

𝔐	The Massoretic Text (*i.e.* the vocalized text of the Hebrew Bible). Variants in the Hebrew codices have been cited from De Rossi, *Variæ Lectiones Vet. Test.*; Kennicott, *Vet. Test. Heb. cum variis lectionibus*; or R. Kittel, *Biblia Hebraica.*
𝔒	Targum Onkelos.
𝔖	The Syriac Version (Peshiṭta).
𝔖ᴴ . . .	The Syro-Hexaplar Version of 𝔊.
𝔗	Targum: $𝔗^1$ $𝔗^2$, etc., first, second renderings in 𝔗.
𝔙	Vulgate.

2. AUTHORS' NAMES AND BOOKS.

[See also the literature cited, especially in the Introduction, §§ 23 n., 28, 41, 45, 48, 50 n., 51 n.]

Anon. . . .	Anonymous Hebrew Commentary, ed. W. A. Wright, with Eng. tr. by S. A. Hirsch (1905)—later than Ibn Ezra and Qi.
AJSL . . .	*American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literature.*
Baer . . .	S. Baer, *Liber Jobi*, 1875.
BDB . . .	See *Lex.*
Be[er, G.] Be^T. Be$^{Kit.}$	(1) *Der Text des Buches Hiob* (1897)—Be^T. (2) Notes in R. Kittel, *Bibl. Hebr.*—Be$^{Kit.}$
Bi[ckell, G.] . .	(1) *Carmina VT metrice*, 1882, pp. 151–187. (2) *Krit. Bearbeitung des Job-Dialogs*, *WZKM*, 1892, pp. 137 ff., 241 ff., 327 ff.; 1893, pp. 1 ff., 153 ff. Cp. (3). *Das Buch Hiob nach Anleitung der Strophik u. d. Septuaginta auf seine ursprüngliche Form zurück-geführt u. im Versmasse des Urtextes übersetzt*, 1894.
Boch[art] . .	*Opera Omnia*, Lugd. 1712.
Bolducius . .	*Comm. in Jobum*, 1631.
Bu[dde], K. . .	(1) *Beiträge zur Kritik des B. Hiob*, 1876. (2) *Das Buch Hiob* (in Nowack's, *Handkommentar*), ^{1}1896, ^{2}1913.
Buhl . . .	See G–B.
Carey, C. P. . .	*The Book of Job translated*, etc., 1858.
Ch[e[yne, T. K.] .	(1) *Job and Solomon*, 1887. (2) *Job* and other contributions to *EBi.*
ChWB . . .	See Levy.
CIS . . .	*Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum*, Paris, 1881 ff.
Cooke, G. A. .	*N*[*orth*] *S*[*emitic*] *I*[*nscriptions*], Oxford, 1903.
Cox, S. . . .	*A Commentary on the Book of Job*, 1880.
CP. . . .	See Rogers.
Da[v[idson], A. B.	(1) *A Commentary on the Book of Job* [i–xiv], 1862. (2) *The Book of Job* in *The Camb. Bible for Schools*, 1884.

DB	Dictionary of the Bible, and in particular *A Dictionary of the Bible*, ed. James Hastings, 1898-1904.
Del[itzsch, Franz]	*Das Buch Hiob* in *Biblischer Comm. ü. d. AT*, [1]1864 (Eng. tr.), [2]1876.
Del[itzsch, Fried.]	(1) *Assyrisches Handwörterbuch*, 1896, cited as *HWB*. (2) *Das Buch Hiob neu übersetzt u. kurzerklärt*, Leipzig, 1902.
Di[llmann, A.]	*Hiob* (in *K*[*urzgefasstes*] *E*[*xegetisches*] *H*[*andbuch*]), [4]1891.
Dr[iver, S. R.]	(1) *A Treatise on the Use of the Tenses in Hebrew*, [3]1892. (2) *An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament* (abbreviated *LOT*), [9]1913. (3) *The Book of Job in the Revised Version*, 1906. (4) *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel*, [2]1913.
Du[hm, B.]	*Das Buch Hiob erklärt* in Marti's *Kurzer Hand-commentar zum AT*, 1897.
EBi.	*Encyclopædia Biblica*, edited by T. K. Cheyne and J. S. Black, 1899–1903.
Ehrlich, A. B.	*Randglossen zur Hebr. Bibel* (1913), vi. 180–344.
ET	*Expository Times*.
Ew.	(1) *Lehrbuch d. Hebr. Sprache*. (2) *Die Dichter des Alten Bundes*, dritter Theil, [2]1854.
Exp.	*The Expositor*.
Forms	See Gray, 3.
Freyt[ag, G. W.]	*Lexicon Arabico-Latinum*, 1830.
G–B.	*Wilhelm Gesenius' hebräisches u. aram. Handwörterbuch über das AT . . . bearbeitet von Frants Buhl*, [16]1915.
Ges[enius, W.]	*Thes*[*aurus*].
GGA	*Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen*.
Gi[nsburg, C. D.]	עשרים וארבעה ספרי הקדש וגו, i.e. *The Old Testament in Hebrew according to MSS and old editions*, 1894.
G–K.	*Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar* . . . English edition by A. Cowley, [2]1910 (=28th German edition, 1909).
Gr[ätz, H.]	*Emendationes in plerosque . . . VT libros*, 1892.
Gray, G. B.	(1) *Studies in Hebrew Proper Names*, 1896 (abbreviated *HPN*). (2) [*A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on*] *Isaiah* [i–xxvii]. (3) [*The*] *Forms* [*of Hebrew Poetry*], 1915.
Ha[hn, H. A.]	*Commentar über d. B. Hiob*, 1850.
Hfm, or Hoffm.	*Hiob nach J. C. E. Hoffmann*, 1891.
Hi[tz[ig, F.]	*Das Buch Hiob übersetzt u. ausgelegt*, 1874.
Hirzel (or Hrz), L.	*KEH*[1] (1839), see Di.
Honth[eim, J.]	*Das Buch Hiob als strophisches Kunstwerk nachgewiesen übersetzst u. erklärt*, 1904.

Houb[igant, C. F.]	*Notæ criticæ in universos VT libros*, ii. 155–218 (1777).
HPN . . .	See Gray, 1.
I[bn] E[zra], Abraham († 1167)	Hebrew Comm. on Job in Buxtorf's *Biblia Rabbinica*.
ICC . . .	*International Critical Commentary*.
Isaiah . . .	See Gray, 2.
JBLit. . . .	*Journal of Biblical Literature*.
Jer[ome] († 420) .	
JDT . . .	*Jahrbücher f. deutsche Theologie*.
JPh . . .	*Journal of Philology*.
JQR . . .	*Jewish Quarterly Review*.
JThS . . .	*Journal of Theological Studies*.
KAT[3] . . .	*Die Keilinschriften u. d. AT*, von Eberhard Schrader, dritte Auflage neu bearbeitet von H. Zimmern u. H. Winckler, 1903.
Kamph[ausen] .	In Bunsen's *Bibelwerk*, Abth. i. Bd. 3, 1865.
KB . . .	*Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek*, von E. Schrader, 1889–1901.
Ḳi	See Qi.
Klo[stermann, A.].	*Hiob* in *PRE* viii. 97–126.
Kön[ig, E.] . .	*Historisch-Kritisches Lehrgebaüde der Hebräischen Sprache*, 1881, 1895: the concluding volume (cited as Kön. iii. or simply Kön.) appeared in 1897 with a fresh title, *Historisch-comparative Syntax d. Hebr. Sprache*.
Königsb[erger, B.]	*Hiob Studien*, 1896.
Kue[nen, A.]. .	*Historisch-Kritisch Onderzoek naar het Ontstaan . . . van de Boeken des Ouden Verbondes*, [2]1865.
Lane, E. W. . .	*An Arabic-English Lexicon*, 1863.
Lex . . .	Lexicon, and unless otherwise defined *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament based on the Thesaurus of Gesenius*, by F. Brown, C. A. Briggs, and S. R. Driver, Oxford, 1906.
Levy, J. . .	(1) *ChWB*, i.e., *Chaldäisches Wörterbuch über die Targumim*, Leipzig, 1881. (2) *NHWB*, i.e., *Neuhebräisches u. Chaldäisches Wörterbuch über die Talmudim u. Midraschim*, 1876–1889.
Lidz[barski, M.] .	(1) *Handbuch d. Nordsem. Epigraphik*, 1898—*NSE*. (2) *Eph*[*emeris f. sem. Epigraphik*], 1900 ff.
LOT . . .	See Dr. 2.
Matthes, J. C. .	*Het Boek Job vertaald en verklaard*, 1865.
Me[rx, A.] . .	*Das Gedicht von Hiob*, 1871.
Meyer, E. . .	[*Die*] *I*[*sraeliten u. ihre*] *N*[*achbar*] *S*[*tämme*], 1906.
Mich[aelis, J. H.].	*Annotationes in Hagiogr.*
NH(*W*)*B* . .	See Levy, 2.
Nöl[d[eke, T.] .	*Beitr*[*äge zur sem. Sprachwissenschaft*], 1904.
Nichols, Helen H..	*The Composition of the Elihu Speeches* (in *AJSL*, vol. xxvii., 1911, and printed separately).

NSE . . . See Lidz.
NSI . . . See Cooke.
Ol[sh[ausen, J.] . *KEH*[2] (1852): see Di.
Oo[rt, H.] . . *Textus Hebraici emendationes quibus in VT Neerlandice vertendo usi sunt A. Kuenen al.*
P[ayne] S[mith, R.] *Thesaurus Syriacus*, 1900.
Pe[a[ke, A. S.] . *The Century Bible: Job*, 1905.
PEFQuSt . . *Palestine Exploration Fund Quarterly Statement.*
Perles, F. . . *Analekten zur Textkritik des AT*, 1895.
PL. . . . Migne, *Paleologia Latina.*
PRE . . . Herzog's *Real-Encyklopädie f. Protestantische Theologie*, 3rd ed. by A. Hauck.
Qi. . . . David Qimḥi (†1230).
Ralbag . . . R[abbi] L[evi] b[en] G[ershon] (†1344): Heb. Comm. in Buxtorf's *Biblia Rabbinica.*
Ra[shi] . . . R[abboni] Sh[elomoh] Y[isḥaḳi] (1040–1105). Hebrew Commentary on Job in Buxtorf's *Bibl. Rabbinica.*
RB . . . *Revue Biblique Internationale publiée par l'École pratique d'Études Bibliques établie au convent Dominicain Saint-Étienne de Jerusalem* (Paris).
R[ei]sk[e, J. J.] . *Conjecturæ in Jobum et Proverbia*, Lips. 1779.
REJ . . . *Revue des Études Juives.*
Renan, E. . . *Le livre de Job*, 1860.
Richter, G. . . *Dunkle Stellen im Buche Hiob*, 1912.
Rogers, R. W. . *C[uneiform] P[arallels to the Old Testament]*.
Ros[enmüller] . *Jobus*, Lips. 1806.
Saad. . . . Saadiah (†942).
Sam[uel][B] . . See Dr. 4.
Schl[ottmann] . *D. B. Hiob*, 1851.
Schnurrer . . *Animadversiones ad quædam loca Jobi*, Tüb. 1781–2.
Schult[ens, A.] . *Liber Jobi*, Lugd. 1737.
S[ie]gf[ried, C.] . *The Book of Job, critical edition of the Hebrew Text*, 1893.
Sievers, E. . . *Metrische Studien* in the *Abhandlungen der phil.-hist. classe d. könig. sächsischen Gesellschaft d. Wissenschaften*, xxi. (1901). The *Textproben* include Job 3–7.
Sta[de, B.] . . (1) *Lehrbuch d. hebr. Sprache*, 1879.
(2) *WB*=Siegfried, C. u. Stade, B., *Hebr. Wörterbuch zum AT.*
St[ick]el. . . *Das Buch Hiob*, 1842.
Strahan, J. . . *The Book of Job interpreted*, 1913.
Stu[der, G. L.] . *Das Buch Hiob*, 1881.
Stuhl[mann, M. H.] *Hiob*, 1804.
Thomson, W. M. . *The L[and and the] B[ook]*, 1867.
Tristram, H. B. . [*The*] *N*[*atural*] *H*[*istory of the*] *B*[*ible*], 1867.
TSK . . . *Theologische Studien u. Kritiken.*
Voi[gt, Cl.] . . *Einige Stellen d. B. Hiob*, Lauban, 1895.

b

We[llh.] . . .	Wellhausen, J.
Wetz[stein] . .	Notes in Del.
Wr[ight, G. H. B.]	*The Book of Job*, 1883.
WZKM . .	*Wiener Zeitschrift f. d. Kunde des Morgenlandes.*
ZA . . .	*Zeitschrift f. d. Assyriologie.*
ZA(T)W . .	*Zeitschrift f. d. Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft.*
ZDMG . .	*Zeitschr. d. deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft.*
ZDPV . . .	*Zeitschrift d. deutschen Pälastina-Vereins.*

Biblical passages are cited according to the Hebrew enumeration of chapters and verses: where this differs from the English enumeration, the reference to the latter has commonly (except in the philological notes) been added in a parenthesis. In the translation of c. 41, however, it seemed more convenient to place the English enumeration first.

The sign †, following a series of references, indicates that all examples of the phrase, word, form or meaning in question, occurring in the OT, have been cited.

The signs ⌜ ⌝ enclosing words in the translation (*e.g.* 3^{14}) indicate departures from 𝔐 (occasionally also departures even from 𝔐 have been so indicated). Small print in the translation indicates probable additions, and unleaded type the longer interpolations of cc. 28. 32–37.

al. = alii (others).

Cp. = Compare.

Ct. = Contrast.

INTRODUCTION

I. Title and Place in the Canon.

§ 1. The Book of Job is one of the eleven books which constitute the third of the three parts of which the Hebrew Scriptures, תורה נביאים וכתובים, consist. In printed Hebrew Bibles it takes the third place among those eleven books, following Ps. and Pr. This order goes back to Hebrew MSS, especially those of German provenance; but other arrangements occur in other MSS or Jewish lists, Job preceding Pr. in the Talmudic list (*Baba Bathra*, 14b) and in many MSS, especially the Spanish, and preceding both Ps. and Pr. in Jer.'s list of the third part of the Hebrew Scriptures.[1] But of Jewish arrangements it may be said (1) that Job is generally grouped together with the *poetical* books Ps. and Pr.; and (2) that this group generally stands at the beginning of the Hagiographa (and consequently immediately after the prophets), or preceded by one book only (Ruth or Ch.).[2]

In 𝔊 and in Greek and Latin lists, owing to the abandonment of the Jewish tripartite division, the different positions

[1] *Prol. Gal.* (*Præf. in Libr. Samuel et Malachim*): "Tertius ordo Ἁγιόγραφα possidet; et primus liber incipit ab *Job*. Secundus a *David*. . . . Tertius est *Salamon*." The premier position thus given to Job was probably due to a chronological consideration, such as is cited and rejected in *Baba Bathra*, 14b: "The order of the Kethubim is Ruth, the Book of Psalms, Job and Proverbs, etc. . . . Now, if it be said, Job lived in the days of Moses, Job therefore should be placed at the head: verily we do not begin with calamity."

[2] Some exceptions to both these general rules are recorded in H. E. Ryle, *The Canon of the Old Testament*, 281 f. More generally on the place of Job in lists, Jewish and others, see Ryle, *op. cit.* ch. xii., and Swete, *Introd. to the OT in Greek*, part ii. ch. i.

assigned to Job become far more numerous. "Much difficulty seems to have been felt as to the place of Job: the book normally appears in connexion with the poetical books, either last or first, but it is sometimes placed among the histories (Augustine, Innocent, Cod. Clarom., Ps.-Gelasius, Cassiodorius), or after the Prophets."[1] In EV., under the influence of what had come to be the standard arrangement of 𝔙,[2] the book stands in an ambiguous position—last of the historical or first of the poetical books. In deference to theories connecting Job with Moses or his age, the book was placed in 𝔖 between Deut. and Jos.[3] In Epiphanius (*de mens et pond.* 23) it stands between Jos. and Judges.

§ 2. Like Joshua or Ruth, the book bears as its title simply the name of its hero—איוב, Ἰώβ. The dissyllabic Hebrew name 'Iyyōb became in 𝔙 Job, and hence in EVV. monosyllabic.

II. Subject and Main Divisions.

§ 3. The Book of Job contains (1) the story of the sudden change in the fortunes of a sheikh of ancient times, and (2) the speeches in a discussion arising out of this. Job, so the story runs, was a man conspicuous for his wealth and good fortune which he had long enjoyed, but not less so for his character, which was beyond reproach from either God or man. On a single day he was stripped of all his possessions and of all his children, and shortly afterwards smitten with a fell disease. The occasion of this tragic change remains unknown to Job, but the reader is at once acquainted with it. One day when Yahweh in heaven was surrounded by the sons of the gods, He commends Job to the attention of one of them, the Satan, as the

[1] Swete, *op. cit.* 228.

[2] MSS of 𝔙 show many different positions of Job (S. Berger, *Histoire de la Vulgate*, 331-339): the still prevailing arrangement according to which Job follows the historical books and immediately precedes Ps. became fixed in the 13th cent. (Berger, p. 304).

[3] Job is also mentioned in this order in Jer. *Ep.* liii. ("Ad Paulinum" · Migne, *PL* xxii. 545). "Saint Jérôme, qui écrivait en Syrie, s'est-il inspiré de l'usage des populations qui l'entouraient?" (Berger, *op. cit.* p. 305).

best man on earth. The Satan at once disputes the depth of Job's piety: it is, he suggests, but skin-deep: if Job be deprived of his wealth, he will abandon his fear of God and blaspheme. Yahweh permits the Satan to put the matter to the test. The Satan strips Job of his wealth; but Job stands the test. The Satan then with equal unsuccess tests Job by depriving him also of his health. Job's wife, indeed, now breaks down, and bids her husband curse God and die; but Job himself still with undiminished piety accepts everything in a spirit of resignation. After an interval of, it is implied (see n. on 1^{11-13}), at least some weeks, three friends of Job come to comfort him, and for seven days sit silently with him. Job then breaks the silence in a monologue raising the question why he and other sufferers are born or compelled to live. There follow two cycles each of six speeches, one by each of the three friends and an answer to each by Job, and a third cycle which, whether so originally or not, is now incomplete, two only of the friends taking part in it. In these speeches the friends assert and Job denies that his calamities are due to his sin. After Job's speech at the conclusion of the third cycle, a new speaker, Elihu, intervenes at great length. Then Yahweh replies to Job, eliciting brief responses from him. After the speeches the story is resumed: taking no account of Elihu, Yahweh condemns what the three friends had said, approves what Job had said, and restores to him twice his former wealth. Thus five main divisions of the existing book are clearly marked:

1. Introduction or Prologue, 1–2.
2. Speeches of Job and the three Friends, 3–31.
3. Speeches of Elihu, 32–37.
4. Speeches of Yahweh with Job's responses, 38^1–42^6.
5. Conclusion or Epilogue, 42^{7-17}.

For fuller analysis of the book see § **31**; and cp. §§ **32–41**.

III. Literary Form.

§ **4.** On the ground of the subject discussed in the speeches (§§ 3, 32–41), Job has commonly and appropriately been classed with Pr., Qoh., Sir., and Wisdom as belonging to the

"Wisdom" or reflective literature[1] of the Jews in which human life is considered broadly without the overruling national interest that characterizes most other Hebrew literature. But in two matters of form Job differs from these other specimens of Jewish wisdom:—(1) in its combination of prose and poetry,[2] the Prologue and Epilogue being prose,[3] the speeches poetry: and (2) in its use of dialogue.[4] Something distantly similar to both these characteristics of the book may be found in other Hebrew literature; but the resemblances are partial, and the book of Job remains unique not only in the "Wisdom," but in the entire literature of the Jews.[5]

[1] See, *e.g.*, C. H. Toy, "Wisdom Literature," in *EBi.*: Dr. *LOT* 392–394; W. T. Davison, *The Wisdom Literature of the O.T.*: C. Siegfried, "Wisdom," in *DB.*

[2] Pr. and Sir. are poetry throughout; Wisdom—written in Greek—is written throughout in a style strongly affected by Hebrew parallelism, possibly also by Hebrew rhythm; whether on this account it should be termed poetry or prose may here be left an open question (cp. *Forms of Hebrew Poetry*, 32 f., 136). Qoh. "is written, as a whole, in prose; but when the thought becomes elevated, or sententious, it falls into the poetical form of rhythmic parallelism" (Dr. *LOT*[6] 465): yet even though this be so, the distribution of prose and poetry in Job and Qoh. is entirely different: in Job the prose parts are prose not passing into poetry, and the poetry is sustained poetry not dropping into prose.

[3] Prose also are the formulæ introducing the several speeches ($3^{1.2}$ 4^1 6^1 etc.) and the longer introduction to Elihu's speeches (32^{1-6a}). The distinction between poetry and prose, already mentioned by Jer. (*Præf. in Lib. Job: PL* xxvii. 1081), is imperfectly marked in 𝔐 by the use of two different systems of accentuation—the ordinary system in 1^1–3^1 and 42^{7-17}, the system employed in Pr. and Ps. in 3^2–42^6, *including* the *prose* of 32^{1-6a} and the introductory formulæ.

[4] Perhaps we might add as a third difference its sustained treatment of a single theme. Sir., the work of a single writer, is indeed longer than Job, but it ranges discursively over a variety of aspects of human life and conduct; so does Pr., the work of many writers. Qoh. and Wisdom are considerably shorter than Job. Outside the "Wisdom" literature the historical compilations are, of course, much longer than Job, but the nearest approach to the sustained treatment of a theme is to be found in Is. 40–55 and Ezk. 40–48, both of which are shorter. In any case, Job has this interest that no other single Hebrew poet has left us the same amount of poetry: this remains true even though a considerable part of Job (28. 32–37. 38–41) be assigned to different poets.

[5] Nor is it unique merely as an exotic, which has its own well-defined class elsewhere. It is, for example, no more similar to a Greek or any other epic or drama than to other works of Hebrew literature. A drama

§ 5. Many books of the OT. contain, it is true, both prose and poetry; but those books are either, like the prophetical books, which contain both prose memoirs and prophetic poems (cp. the Introd. to *Isaiah*), not single works, or, as in the prose historical books which *cite* poems, they combine the styles differently. On the other hand, Job, if the substantial integrity of the book can be maintained, is a single work written partly in prose, partly in poetry, the narrative in prose, the speeches in poetry. For analogies to this we must go beyond Hebrew literature: *e.g.* to the *Maḳâmât* of Hariri in which the narrative is in rhymed prose, but the (longer) speeches of the characters are (commonly) metrical poems.

§ 6. Again some analogy to the dialogue, to the response of two or more speakers to one another, is to be found, for example, in Canticles (*e.g.* $1^{7f. 16f.}$ 2^{1-8}); but for dialogue as a means of discussing problems of life, we must again pass for analogy beyond Jewish literature. Such dialogue[1] until recently was quite unknown in Babylonian literature; but certain texts—one of the age of Sargon (722–705 B.C.)—have now been published containing what their editor describes as specimens of philosophical dialogue.[2] These, however, offer a very distant

in any strict sense it is certainly not; in the Prologue there is movement indeed, but the Prologue is narrative,—an anticipation of the novel rather than of the drama,—and in the dialogue there is no dramatic movement. There are in the book, it is true, all the elements that might have been combined by a Greek into a great drama: the Hebrew writer has used them differently, and his work was certainly never acted in ancient Judah. Job has, I am informed, been recently staged in New York, and, according to my informant, the performance was very impressive; but this no more proves that the Hebrew work was a drama than H. G. Wells' *Undying Fire* proves that it was a novel. Reference may also be made to the judicious criticism by C. G. Montefiore in the *Harvard Theological Review*, 1919, 219–224, of *The Book of Job as a Greek Tragedy*, in which the author (H. M. Kallen) seeks to prove that the existing book of Job is the result of editorial manipulations of what was originally a Hebrew imitation of a Euripidean tragedy.

[1] Dialogue of a *different* type was known; and Kön. (*Einl.* 410f.) had even compared that in the "Descent of Ishtar" (Rogers, *CP* 121 ff.) with that in Job, on the ground that both were cases of dialogue introduced into epic.

[2] E. Ebeling, *Keilinscrifttexte aus Assur rel. Inh.* iii. 193; *Mitteilungen der vorderasiatischen Gesellschaft*, 1918², pp. 50–70 (German translation with

parallel to the dialogue as handled in Job; they are simple, brief, and exceedingly schematic. In a dozen sections all cast in the same scheme and some eight lines in length, the advantages and disadvantages of various courses of action are discussed by a master and his slave. Between the Babylonian "philosophical dialogue," so far as yet known, and the dialogue in Job the difference is so great as to render any direct influence of one over the other altogether improbable. And the same is true, though in this case the difference is of quite another kind, of the Greek dialogue. It is curious that the most famous examples of this were written at probably no great distance of time from Job, and it is barely possible, though not probable (§§ 42–47), that the author of Job wrote later than Plato; yet between the dialogue of Job, consisting exclusively of long set speeches in poetical form, and the prose dialogues of Plato, with their closely knit analytical argument carried on by means of much quickly responsive conversation, the difference is so great that the probability that the Hebrew writer was influenced by those Greek literary models is so slight as to be negligible. So long as Job was commonly regarded as long anterior to Plato, it was not customary to look upon Plato as an imitator of Job; there is just as little reason now that Job is referred to a later age than formerly to assert that it is "unquestionably a Hebrew imitation of the philosophical dialogue of Plato."[1] Whence the author derived any suggestion for the use of dialogue in discussing the problems of life thus remains quite obscure.

notes). Cp. *ET*, 1920, pp. 420–423, where will be found an English translation of six of the sections, of which one may here serve as an illustration:

"Slave, attend to me! 'Yes, my lord, yes.'
'I will love a woman.' 'Yes, love, my lord, love!
A man who loves a woman forgets trouble and care.'
'No, slave, I will not love a woman.' 'Love not, my lord, love not.
Woman is a pit, a hole that is dug;
Woman is an iron dagger, sharp, which cuts a man's throat.'"

[1] Oscar Holtzmann in Stade's *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, ii. 331.

IV. Origin and History of the Book: Possible Sources and Additions.

§ 7. The unique character of the combination of prose and poetry in the book (§ 5) has sometimes been treated as the result of the origin of the book, of the existing material which the author utilized. What was this? That the book is a report of facts of history, the exact record in prose of the actual fortunes of a particular individual and of the words spoken in verse by him and others, is a view that was long maintained or accepted,[1] though not even in earlier times without occasional suggestions that the book is fiction.[2] It is unnecessary to repeat here the arguments against a view which has become entirely antiquated. But if the book is not history, and the speeches not the *ipsissima verba* of speeches reported *verbatim*, it need not be pure invention; the story with which it opens and closes may be, and in part almost certainly is, based on or derived from popular tradition or literature; and, indeed, this is quite certain, if the book is rightly inferred to have been written after the Exile (see § 42 ff.), for Ezk. $14^{14. 20}$ refers to

[1] A defence of the strictly historical character of the book may be found in the learned work of S. Lee, *The Book of the Patriarch Job* (1837), p. 6 ff.: this was directed especially against Warburton, *Divine Legation*, Book vi. sect. 2, in which reasons for regarding the book as—in the main at least—not historical are already set forth.

[2] איוב לא היה ולא נברא אלא משל היה is a judgement attributed to an unnamed contemporary of Samuel b. Nachmani (*Baba Bathra*, 15a: Eng. tr., Ryle, *Canon*, 276 f.). Similarly in *Bereshith Rabba*, § 57, a judgement is attributed to Resh Laḳish (3rd cent. A.D.)—though it is noted that this conflicts with another judgement assigned to the same Rabbi—to the effect that the sufferings of Job are not historical though, had they actually befallen him, he would have endured them. ריש לקיש אמר איוב לא היה ולא נהיה . . . מאי לא היה ולא נהיה בייסורים שנכתבו עליו ולמה נכתבו עליו אלא שאילו באו עליו היה יכול לעמוד בהן. See, further, Isaac Wiernikowski, *Das Buch Hiob nach der Auffassung des Talmud u. Midrasch* (Breslau, 1902), p. 28. Maimonides (*Moreh Nebuchim*, iii. 22) says of the book: "its basis is a fiction, conceived for the purpose of explaining the different opinions which people held on Divine Providence. You know that some of our sages clearly stated Job never existed, and was never created, and that he is a poetic fiction. Those who assume that he existed, and that the book is historical, are unable to determine when and where Job lived. . . . This difference of opinion supports the assumption that he never existed in reality."

Job[1] along with Noah and Daniel, as a conspicuously righteous man. Among those—and they are all but all who have discussed the subject—who admit that the author has utilized tradition or popular story,[2] there is, however, wide difference of judgement as to how much he has derived from thence, some holding that he owes nothing more to tradition (and that in the form of popular *oral* tradition) than that there was once a righteous man named Job,[3] others that the entire prologue and epilogue were excerpted by him from *a book* containing the popular story (a "Volksbuch").[4] Between these two extremes it is possible to hold as a middle view that the fundamental elements of the story—the righteousness of Job, his endurance under trial, etc.—the scene in which it is laid and the names of the persons are some or all of them derived from tradition; if this were so, it might offer some suggestions as to whence the story came.

§ 8. The scene of the book is outside the land of Israel. This might be explained as due to the deliberate choice of a "Wisdom" writer, seeking in this way to enforce the wide human and not merely national nature of his subject. If this were the correct explanation, the particular scene chosen by

[1] It is quite unnecessary with Halévy (*REJ* xiv. 20) to substitute אנוש for איוב in Ezk. $14^{14.20}$.

[2] On the divergence of the book of Job from the popular legend, whether written or oral, and for the history of the legend independently of our book of Job, see D. B. Macdonald, "Some External Evidence on the Original Form of the Legend of Job" (*AJSL* xiv. (1898) 137-164) and earlier, *JBLit.* xiv. 63-71. Macdonald suggests that not only Ezk. but also James (5^{11}) refers to the legend, not to our book of Job.

[3] So Karl Kautzsch, *Das sogenannte Volksbuch von Hiob* (1900), 18 ff., 87. Rather more traditional basis is postulated by Che.: "Most probably all that he adopted from legend was (1) the name of the hero and the land in which he lived; (2) the fact of Job's close intercourse with God; and (3) the surprising circumstance that this most righteous and divinely favoured of men was attacked by some dread disease such as leprosy, but was subsequently healed" (*EBi.* ii. 2469).

[4] Du. (p. vii): of the "Volksbuch the opening has been preserved in cc. 1. 2 of the existing book of Job, the conclusion in 42^{7-17} and also perhaps a fragment in 38^{1}; discussions between Job and the three friends, and a speech of Yahweh to Job, also formed part of this popular book, but these have given place to discussions of an entirely opposite character in the existing book."

the writer would be of little significance, and the reason for the author's choice withdrawn from us. On the other hand, if the scene was traditional, it may point to the region whence the story passed to Israel, just as the scene of the story and its place of origin are associated in such a story as that of the Tower of Babel (Babylon). Broadly the scene is clearly fixed as east of Canaan; but whether it lay in or about Edom or farther north, and in particular in the Hauran, is less certain, the evidence afforded by (1) names and terms (§§ 9–13), (2) tradition (§ 14), and (3) the nature of the country implied in the story (§ 15) being inconclusive and conflicting.

§ 9. (1) *Names and terms.*—Job himself lived in the land of 'Ûṣ, and was, it is implied, one of the "sons of the East" (1^{5}): unfortunately the position of the land of 'Ûṣ cannot be closely determined, and the "sons of the East" is a term of wide application.

The "sons of the East" (בני קדם; cp. הקדמני, Gn. 15^{19}) in Jg. $6^{3.\ 33}$ 7^{12} 8^{10} are coupled with Midianites and Amalekites as nomad raiders of Western Palestine, in Is. 11^{14} they are opposed to the Philistines on the W., and mentioned with, but probably as distinguished from, Edom, Moab and Ammon, and in Ezk. $25^{4.\ 10}$ they are nomads (cp. Jer. 49^{28} nomads : ‖ Ḳedar) distinguished from, as dwelling E. of, Ammon and Moab. In 1 K. 5^{10} (4^{30}) they are merely mentioned as famed for their wisdom; on Gn. 29^{1} †, see below. The "land of the East" (ארץ קדם) lay east of Abraham's settlement in *southern* Canaan (Gn. 25^{6}). From Gn. 29^{1} it has been inferred that the "sons of the East" and their land extended also to the far *north*-east of Palestine, to beyond the Euphrates; but this is a precarious inference from a composite narrative; the source may rather have intended, as in Gn. 25^{6}, country E. or *south*-east of Palestine (see Skinner on Gn. 29^{1}; Meyer, *INS* 242 ff.); a southern, but not necessarily any far northern, district is implied in an Egyptian reference (about 2000 B.C.) to Ḳedem : in this Sinuhe relates that he passed out of Egypt into the desert, moved thence from place to place and arrived at Ḳedem, whence he was invited into Palestine: see W. Max Müller, *Asien u. Europa*, 46; Meyer, *l.c.*; Breasted, *Ancient Records*, i. 493.

§ 10. The name 'Ûṣ (עוץ) appears to be brought into connection with three distinct districts. (*a*) Northern Mesopotamia : to this district Gn. 10^{23} (P)=1 Ch. 1^{17} 'Uṣ the "son" of Aram is commonly referred: see Skinner, *Genesis*, p. 206. But apparently the same 'Uṣ is (Gn. 22^{21}) brother of Buz., who in Jer. 25^{23} is associated with the distinctly Arabian Dedan and Têma. (*b*) Damascus and the country S. of it: Jos. (*Ant.* I. vi. 4; cp. Jer. *Quæst. in Gen.* 10^{23}) states that Οὔσης the son of Aram (*i.e.* the 'Uṣ of Gn. 10^{23}) founded Damascus and Trachonitis, *i.e.* the volcanic country beginning

25 m. S. of Damascus and 40 m. E. of the sea of Galilee (see *EBi.* TRACHONITIS). (*c*) Edom, or the neighbourhood of Edom: in Gn. 36^{28} = 1 Ch. 1^{42} Uṣ is a figure in the genealogy of "Seir in the land of Edom" (*ib.* $^{20f.}$). In La. 4^{21} "the land of Uṣ" (ארץ עוץ precisely as in Job 1^1) stands in parallelism with Edom; unfortunately some doubt rests on the text, for rhythmically the line can spare a word and 𝔊 om. עוץ; however, the mere omission of עוץ with 𝔊 leaves an unsatisfactory phrase and an improbable text. Doubt also rests on ארץ העוץ in Jer. 25^{20}, for 𝔊 omits the clause containing it. If the geographical distribution of the term 'Uṣ was as wide as this survey suggests, viz. from Edom to Northern Mesopotamia, this may have been due to 'Uṣ, or rather 'Aus (𝔊 Αὐσῖτις), itself certainly tribal rather than geographical, being the name of widely scattered tribes—Arab tribes, perhaps, deriving their name from a god 'Auḍ (عوض), as W. R. Smith suggested (*Kinship*, 261, and, in reply to Nö.'s criticism in *ZDMG* xl. 183, *Rel. of the Semites*, 43). But though the tribes of 'Uṣ were widely scattered, it would not necessarily follow that the whole region over which they were scattered, or several distinct districts within it, passed by the name of the *land of Uṣ*. Apart from Job 1^1, the only passage casting a direct light on the situation of the *land* of 'Uṣ is, if the text can be trusted, La. 4^{21}, and this decisively connects it with Edom.

§ 11. Of the three friends of Job, Eliphaz certainly appears to come from Edom, Bildad from a tribe that may have been closely associated with Edom, while Ṣophar's origin is very uncertain. (On the name and origin of Elihu, see 32^2 n.)

Teman, the home of Eliphaz, lay at one, and that probably the northern, extremity of Edom (Ezk. 25^{13}), though other sites within Edom have been attributed to it (see *EBi. s.v.*). Shuaḥ (Gn. 25^2 = 1 Ch. $1^{32f.}$), Bildad's tribe, claimed descent from Abraham through Ḳeṭurah, and, according to Gn. 25^3 𝔊, was "uncle" of Sheba, *Teman* and Dedan, whence we may infer that Eliphaz and Bildad lived in regions not very remote from one another. The suggestion formerly put forward by Fried. Del. and accepted or favourably entertained by many writers (Dr. on Gn. 25^2; Peake on Job 1^1; G–B.^{15}, *s.v.*; Meyer *INS* 314; Glaser, *Skizzen*, ii. 445 f.), that Bildad's home was Suḫu on the Euphrates—some weeks' journey from Teman—has been withdrawn by Del. himself (*Hiob*, p. 139). Ṣophar the Na'amathite certainly did not come from Na'amah (Jos. 15^{41}) in the Philistine plain (though Ley (*Das Buch Hiob.* 27) is willing to believe it, and to infer that he was intended to play the rôle of a representative of the religion of Israel!), nor necessarily from the Calebite Na'am (1 Ch. 4^{15}), so that Ṣophar also would be an Edomite (*EBi.* 5427), nor from distant Ma'in in southern Arabia, or even from the Minæan colony or trading station at El-Ōla—which lay some three or four hundred miles S. of the home of Eliphaz. 𝔊, it is true, describes Ṣophar as ὁ Μιναίων βασιλεύς, thinking not of El-Ōla, which as a trading colony would not be the seat of a king, but presumably of Ma'in 1200 miles away; but this is

in accordance with its tendency to turn Job's friends, great sheikhs of neighbouring tribes, into kings and tyrants of nations. Barton (*JBLit.*, 1912, p. 66), reviving suggestions of Wetzstein in Del., connects Na'amathite with en-No'eme in the Nuḳra (see § 14)—a suggestion that may fall in with but cannot establish a theory—and Temanite with Tema in the same region; but judiciously finds the connection of Shuite with Ṣueta (صويت), also in the same region, "unsatisfying."

§ 12. Some of the personal names are suggestive, or possibly suggestive, of Edom.

Not Job itself: איוב is unknown in Hebrew literature except as the name of the hero of the book, for with יוב (Gn. 46^{13}: EV. Job), and, in spite of 42^{17} 𝔊, יובב (Gn. 10^{29}), it has nothing to do. The name may, on the analogy of יִלּוֹד, have suggested to Hebrew readers or hearers of the story the meaning "the object of enmity," though the form קטּוֹל regularly expresses an active sense; alternatively it has been connected with the root which gives the Arabic أَوَّاب (penitent). But the etymology and the identification with the proper name A-ia-bu (Tel el-Amarna Tablet, $237^{6.\ 18}$) are alike uncertain. If of foreign origin the name may have been modified in the course of Hebrew tradition so as to express a meaning. Eliphaz, on the other hand, is well authenticated as an Edomite name (Gn. $36^{10ff.}$ = 1 Ch. $1^{35f.}$), though being of a(n early) type that was widely spread, it must not be assumed that the name was exclusively Edomite. Bildad (בלדד, Βαλδαδ) is unknown except through the story of Job, though Che. (*EBi.* 4495) and Bu. recall the Edomite בדד (Gn. 36^{35}): the first element perhaps recurs in the Edomite בלהן, Βαλααν (Gn. 36^{27}), which is also the name of a Benjamite (1 Ch. 7^{10}), and in בלעם (Ammonite?; Nu. 22^{5}) and בלשן (Babylonian-Jewish, Ezr. 2^{2}): the second element occurs in the Hebrew אלדד and elsewhere (*HPN* 60 ff.). Ṣophar as written in 𝔐 in 11^{1} 42^{9} (צפר: but צופר in 2^{11} 20^{1}) is identical with the name of the father of Balak, king of Moab, as written in Nu. 22^{10} 23^{18} (צפר; but צפור elsewhere). In 𝔊 the name of Job's friend, Σωφαρ, Σοφαρ, is always distinguished from Balak's father Σεπφωρ, Σεφωρ. In 𝔐 צופר does not occur except in Job; but Σωφαρ occurs in Gn. $36^{11.\ 15}$ (𝔐 צפו), 1 Ch. 1^{36} (𝔐 צפי) in Edomite genealogies and in close connection with Eliphaz and Teman. The Palmyrene צפרא (Lidz. *NSE* 359; *Eph.* i. 347, ii. 293, 312) is Σεφφερα (cp. De Vogué, *Syrie Centrale*, p. 15), and so probably is צפרי (Lidz. i. 199, ii. 303).

§ 13. The references to Sheba (1^{15}) and the "Chaldæans" (1^{17}) as raiding Job have also been invoked in determining the situation of his home: thus Dhorme (*RB*, 1911, 105) concludes that "nous sommes amenés au nord-ouest de l'Arabie quelque part au sud de Ma'an," *i.e.* to the frontiers of Edom. Yet even if the terms are correctly read, such a conclusion is probably too precise.

𝔊 in 1[15] has *οἱ αἰχμαλωτεύοντες* (=שׁבָה taken collectively), and in [17] *οἱ ἱππεῖς*, which may be an interpretation of כשדים (see phil. n. on 1[17]), or a translation of a different text—of פרשים (Che. *ET* viii. 433) rather than of רכשים (Nestle, *ib.*) or חולים (Hommel, *ib.* 378 f., 431). Barton (*JBLit.*, 1912, 67) follows 𝔊: Che. (*EBi.* 968, 2469) emends כשדים into כשים (north-Arabian) Cushites, and Hommel (*l.c.*) into חולים, those of Ḥavilah. None of these suggestions, however, is *more* probable than 𝔐. But what does 𝔐 mean? That Job, a great sheikh indeed but not a monarch, was raided by the forces of two distant and famous kingdoms—the Chaldæans of Babylonia and the Sabæans (see on 1[15])—is unlikely even in fiction. Even if this is the meaning, which seems highly unlikely, any part of the land of the children of the E. would have been as likely as any other to receive an attack from this curious combination. But if כשדים here and in 2 K. 24[2] are nomads E. or S.E. (note the order in 2 K., particularly if אדם be read for ארם) of Judah (see on 1[15], also Dhorme, *RB*, 1910, 384; 1911, 105), Job's home must no doubt be placed not too far north, but whether it is *necessary* to place it farther south than the Hauran is questionable. The Sheba intended, though not the south Arabian kingdom, certainly lay south of Edom (1[15] n.).

§ 14. (2) Tradition, Christian (from the 4th cent. A.D.) and Moslem, persistently connect Job with the Hauran,[1] and more exactly with the Nuḳra, "the great plain of the Hauran and the granary of Syria" (Baedeker, *Palestine*[3], 183), where Der 'Eyyub, some forty miles S.S.W. of Damascus, perpetuates Job's name to the present day. Dhorme (*RB*, 1911, 103 f.), however, explains this tradition as due to a series of confusions, and finds traces of an early alternative Christian tradition in Chrysostom on Job 2[8] and 'Isho'dad († *c.* 850) on Job 1[1], who speaks of a land of 'Uṣ still existing in Arabia. However this may be, still earlier association of Job with Edom is certainly found in the appendix to 𝔊, which makes Job a king of Edom.

§ 15. (3) The nature of the country in which Job's home lay, if considered by itself, would point strongly to such a district as the Hauran rather than to Edom. For Job's home lay in a country of great farms, at once near a town and yet open to the desert (see on 1[1-5], p. 2). But Edom, the home of Esau, was among the Hebrews proverbially distinguished from such country as being "away from the fatness of the earth and from the dew of heaven" (Gn. 27[39]). Job obviously in habit

[1] See Wetzstein's Appendix in Del.; Clermont-Ganneau, *Rec. d'Archéologie Orientale*, v. 11 ff.; Guy Le Strange, *Palestine under the Moslems*, 515.

of life more nearly resembles Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, than Esau.

Thus a number of small considerations combine to suggest, though not to prove, that certain elements in the story of Job came to Israel from or through Edom; but others, while still compatible with an Eastern origin, would seem to indicate that certain features of the story, if originally Edomite, have become blurred and indistinct or transformed.

§ 16. More recently quite a different class of evidence from that already considered has been adduced in order to suggest that the ultimate source of Job is in Babylonian literature. In this case it is not the scene and the names, but the substance of the story, and in particular the speeches of Job, that are involved. The particular Babylonian poem[1] which has provoked this theory has sometimes been described as the "Babylonian Job." The hero of the poem—a king, as most have concluded—was named Tabi-utul-Bel (Jastrow), or Šubši-mešri-Nergal (Landersdorfer), Tabi-utul-Bel in the latter case being another king warned by Ur-bau in a dream to take a message to Šubši-mešri-Nergal. Tabi-utul-Bel is described as dwelling in Nippur, and the god Marduk is mentioned: other names of places and persons do not occur.

The poem opens:

I will praise the Lord of Wisdom,

[1] It has survived fragmentarily in several copies of the 7th cent. B.C., and a commentary on the poem has also been discovered; and so we may infer that, probably itself far older than the 7th cent., the poem was then still much read and studied. It appears to have extended to four tablets, containing about 300, or perhaps about 480 lines: of the first tablet only a few lines survive, of the second the greater part, of the third and fourth less—in all, probably somewhat more or less than a half. The poem is mostly in 4:4 rhythm (Job is in 3:3: see § 52). On the history, restoration and interpretation of the poem, see M. Jastrow, *Rel. Bab. u. Assyr.* ii. 120–133; *JBLit.*, 1906, 135–191; *Contemporary Review*, Dec. 1906, 801–808; S. Landersdorfer, "Eine babylonische Quelle f. d. B. J." (*Biblische Studien*, xiv. 2), 1911; Martin, "Le juste souffrant," in *Journal Asiatique*. 10th series, xvi. 75–143. See also Zimmern in *KAT*[3] 384–386 (where parallelism not with Job, but with the servant of Yahweh is suggested); Rogers, *CP* 164–169 (translation of the second tablet); R. Campbell Thomson, *PSBA*, 1910, 18 ff. Further literature is given by Jastrow and Landersdorfer (pp. 11–14).

presumably for release from the sufferings, which the rest of what survives of the first tablet describes :

> Although a [kin]g, I have become a slave.
> The day is filled with groaning, the night with weeping :
> The night with howling, the year with mourning (cp. Job $7^{3f.}$).

The second tablet opens as follows :

> I attained to (long) life, I moved beyond the appointed time ;
> (Wherever) I turn, (there is) evil, evil ;
> Oppression is increased, righteousness I see not ;

and then after recording that he had appealed to his god, his goddess and various classes of enchanters, etc. (ll. 4–9), he passes on to say that trouble has overtaken him as though he had been negligent in his religious duties (12–23), whereas he was only conscious of having been exemplary in his conduct :

> But I myself took thought only for prayers and supplications,
> Prayer was my rule, sacrifice my order.

This passage concludes with the lines :

> The respect of the king I made of highest power :[1]
> In reverence of the palace I instructed the people :
> For I knew that before the god such deeds are in good favour.

This is immediately followed by reflections on the mysterious ways and judgements of the gods, which are beyond the comprehension of man's short life and subject to sudden changes of fortune :

That which seemeth good to itself, that is evil with god :
And that which in its heart is rejected, that is good with his god.
Who can understand the counsel of the gods in heaven?
The plan of the gods full of darkness, who shall establish it?
How shall pale-faced men understand the way of the god! (cp. Job $4^{17ff.}$).
He who lives in the evening is in the morning dead (cp. Job 34^{20} 27^{19} $4^{19f.}$).
Quickly is he in trouble, suddenly is he smitten ;
In a moment he is singing and playing,
In an instant he is howling like a complainer ;
Every moment, so are their thoughts changed.
Now they are hungry, and are like a corpse,
Again they are full, and like unto their god.
If it go well with them, they speak of climbing up to heaven :
If they be in trouble, they talk of going down to hell.

The suffering king now describes his sufferings and the symptoms of his malady : the particularity of the description and some of the figures employed recall Job's descriptions of himself ; of this long description it it must suffice to cite a few lines :

With a whip he has beaten me,—
With a staff he has pierced me, the point was strong.
All day long doth follow the avenger,

---

[1] Variant : like a god. Jastrow supposes that the king had sinned in allowing the people to pay him divine honour.

In the middle of the night he lets me not breathe for a moment (cp. Jb. $7^{13f.}$ 30^{17}).
Through tearings my joints are sundered,
My limbs are undone . . .
Upon my couch I passed the night like a bull,
I was covered with my excrement like a sheep.
My symptoms of fever were not clear (?) to the magicians.

He felt himself forsaken, in immediate prospect of death, and already given up for dead:

The god helped me not, he took me not by the hand;
My goddess did not pity me, she came not to my side.
The sarcophagus hath opened (cp. Jb. $17^{1. 13f.}$) . . .
Before I was dead, the death wail was finished.
My whole land cried out, "Alas!" (or, He is ruined).
Mine enemy heard, his face glowed,
To my female enemy they brought the good tidings, her spirits brightened up.

The opening line of the third tablet, "Heavy was his hand, I could no more endure it" (cp. Jb. 23^2 𝔊), seems to represent the sufferer as reduced to despair. But God now intervenes on his behalf: for at this point, so far as can be judged from the broken and difficult text, a revelation relating to the sufferer's case is communicated to him. When the text becomes clearer again, the sufferer is obviously recording the removal of his sins and of the various symptoms of his illness:

My sins he caused the wind to carry away;
. . . .
Into the depths of the abyss he sent back the evil spirit;

and the poem appears to conclude with the restoration of the sufferer to the favour of Marduk.

§ 17. Among the points of resemblance between this poem and Job are the poetical form, the subject, viz. the sudden reduction of a man of great position, who had already lived a long and prosperous life, to great misery of mind, body and estate, the long description of his sufferings put into the mouth of the sufferer,[1] the contrast between these sufferings and the kind of life to which his long-maintained piety might have been expected to lead, the reflections on the mysteries of God's dealings with mortals. These resemblances are certainly noticeable, but the differences are equally striking. The names of the persons, the topography, the rank[2] of the sufferer

[1] Parallels to this are frequent among the so-called Babylonian "penitential Psalms" and the Hebrew Psalms (*e.g.* 22. 102).

[2] Landersdorfer rightly insists that the transformation of a king into a sheikh is against the normal tendency of popular tradition.

are all different: there is no parallel in the Babylonian work to the combination of narrative[1] and discourse in Job, there is no parallel at all to the dialogue which forms so conspicuous and distinguishing a feature of Job: there is a sharp and crucial difference between the two works on the question of guilt as a cause of the sufferings described; Yahweh in the Prologue and Job in his speeches agree in asserting the innocence of Job; Yahweh asserts the perfection of Job's character, and Job is certain that his sufferings cannot be explained by any sin that he has committed. On the other hand, the Babylonian sufferer, though he is conscious of having been punctilious in the discharge of duties the neglect of which would have explained his sufferings, is anything but certain that he has not committed some sin which, unknown to him, may have been displeasing to the gods and therefore the cause of his sufferings; and he more or less clearly admits that he had done amiss. His problem is to discover what it is that he has done to displease the gods and so to bring his sufferings upon himself. Job's problem is to understand how God can plague him though he has done nothing to displease Him. Finally, the difference in the name and country of the heroes of the two works points strongly away from, at any rate, any close connection between them.[2] At present, at all events, it cannot be said that any Babylonian source of the book of Job has been made out.

§ 18. Whence and in what form the story used by him came to the author of the book of Job, what predecessors he may have had in the employment of dialogue as a literary form, are questions that evidence external to the book and such internal evidence as we have so far examined answer at best very incompletely and uncertainly. But there are some who find a much more precise answer at least to the question in what form

[1] Even if the two or three lines mentioning the name and residence of Tabi-utul-Bel were, as Jastrow claimed, narrative, standing as they do in the middle of the poem and being themselves in verse, they would form no real parallel to the sustained *prose* narrative of the Prologue and Epilogue of Job.

[2] Che (*EBi.* 2469) suggests a different Babylonian origin for both the Hebrew story and the name of its hero: 'Iyyob is Eabani, the friend of Gilgamesh.

the story came to the author of the existing book. On the ground of differences in style and in other respects it has been claimed that the Prologue and Epilogue are the work of a writer not identical with the author of the Dialogue,[1] but that the latter extracted these from a prose book of Job,[2] and inserted his Dialogue between them.

There is one difference between Prologue and Epilogue on the one hand and Dialogue on the other that might at first seem to point to a use of sources in Job similar to that apparent in the Pentateuch: the Prologue and Epilogue employ, the Dialogue (3–31) studiously avoids, the use of the name Yahweh, regularly employing in its stead God (El, Eloah) or, like P, the Almighty (Shaddai).

§ 19. The use of the divine names in different parts of the book is as follows:

Name.	Number of Occurrences in				Total.
	Cc. 1. 2 and 42^{7-17}.	Cc. 3–31.	Cc. 32–37.	Cc. 38–42^{6}.	
אל .	0	33	19	3	55
אלוה .	0	33	6	2	41
שדי .	0	24	6	1	31
אלהים .	8	3	2	1	14
האלהים .	3	0	0	0	3
יהוה .	23	1 (12^{9})	0	5	29

[1] In an earlier stage of criticism, a theory (now generally and rightly abandoned), according to which the Dialogue was written first and the Prologue and Epilogue were added later by another writer, gained some currency: so, according to K. Kautzsch, to whose dissertation, *Das sogenannte Volksbuch von Hiob*, 3 ff., reference may be made for the history of this theory, first Simon (1685), then Schultens (1737), Hasse (1789), Stuhlmann (1804), de Wette (1807), Studer (1875), who threw out the suggestion that the original introduction to the poem exists in c. 29 f. (*Jahrb. f. protest. Theologie*, i. 706 ff.). S. Lee (1837) held that Job committed the speeches to writing, and that Moses added the Prologue and Epilogue.

[2] So Du. most incisively (see p. xxvi, n. 4). For earlier theories of the Prologue (and Epilogue) as derived from or resting on an earlier popular (prose) book of Job, see Che. *Job and Solomon*, p. 66 ff.; Hoffmann; Bu.

עליון never occurs in Job, nor האל, for in view of the frequent occurrence of אל without the article it would be illegitimate to assume its presence with the particles ל and כ (cf. לָאֵל, כָּאֵל) in 13^8 21^{14} 22^{17} 31^{28} 33^6 $34^{10.37}$ (cp. G–B. pp. 36b, 37a). The pl. אלים occurs nowhere in the existing text, nor should it be introduced by emendation (Che.) in $41^{1(9)}$. אדני occurs only in 28^{28}. The terms regularly used in other parts of the book *never* occur in the Prologue and Epilogue, and the terms used in the Prologue and Epilogue occur either not at all or very rarely, or only under special circumstances, in the other parts of the book: thus the single occurrence in cc. 3–31 of יהוה is in 12^9—an interpolated v., and the five occurrences in 38–42^6 all occur not in the speeches, but in the *narrative* links (38^1 $40^{1.3.6}$ 42^1); the three occurrences of אלהים in 3–31 are in c. 28^{23} (probably an interpolated c.), 20^{29} a rhythmically overloaded line, and 5^8, where *perchance* אלהים has arisen from אלוה under the influence of the following אשים; and of two occurrences in 32–37, one occurs in the prose introduction (32^2), the other in 34^9 which may be an interpolation. In part the difference of usage in different parts of the book is merely part of the difference between the language of prose and that of poetry: so at least we may account for the use of אל to the almost complete exclusion of אלהים in the poetical parts. But the use of אל, שדי and אלוה to the complete exclusion of יהוה in the speeches must be due to the fact that the *speakers* are represented as living before, or outside the sphere of, the revelation of the name Yahweh; on the other hand, the *narrator*, alike in the Prologue and Epilogue and in 38–42^6, regularly uses Yahweh. Again, as the term Yahweh is avoided in the speeches of 3–42^6, so is it absent from the words of Job in 1^5 2^{10}, and of the messenger in 1^{16}, and of Job's wife in 2^9, (ה)אלהים being used instead; only in 1^{21} is Yahweh used in words of Job, this speech thus differing not only from the longer speeches of 3–42^6 but also from the briefer sayings in 1. 2. Whether or not this difference *within the Prologue* can be satisfactorily explained, in view of the *difference* of usage *in speeches* within the Prologue and the *identity* of usage *in narrative* in the Prologue and in 38–42^6 (in 3–31 there is no opportunity for the use of יהוה in narrative), it is very precarious to infer from the use of the divine names that the Prologue and Dialogue are the work of different writers. Other differences may be more significant: viz., in c. 28 the use (see p. 232 n.) of Elohim and Adonai and the greater relative frequency of אל in 32–37 (see § 24).

§ 20. If the differing use of the divine names in the Prologue and Dialogue and the mere fact that the one is prose, the other poetry do not point to difference of authorship, certainly nothing else in the style and vocabulary does so: on the other hand, there are certain noticeable similarities of usage which, if they do not by themselves prove, yet rather favour the common authorship, or, failing that, a rather thorough assimilation by the author of the one of the style of the other.

Thus Prologue and Dialogue agree in describing Job as perfect and in expressing this preferably by the forms תָּם and תֻּמָּה as against the forms תָּמִים

and אם which are more frequent in other books (see n. on 1^{1}). The particle אולם is a common characteristic of various parts of the book, being as frequent in Job as in the whole of the rest of the OT. (see phil. n. on 33^{1}); note also בלע, meaning *to destroy* (2^{3} n.); נוד, *to console* 2^{11} 42^{11}, ניד, 16^{5} (2^{11} n.); על פני פ' (defiantly), 1^{11} ('אל פ, 2^{5} 13^{15}) 6^{28} 21^{31}, רעים of Job's three friends (2^{11} 19^{21}), כאב, 2^{13} 16^{6} (but מכאב in Elihu, 33^{19}). Most of these with several other—mostly insignificant—similarities of vocabulary are given in K. Kautzsch, *Das sogenannte Volksbuch von Hiob*, pp. 39–44. Noticeable also in this connection is the presence in 2^{10} of the very pronounced Aramaism קבל (for Hebrew לקח), as a companion of the Aramaisms of the Dialogue (§§ 28, 47). It may be observed that these similarities—for what they may possess of positive worth—are confined to the Prologue, and do not extend to the Epilogue.

Other grounds for assuming difference of authorship have been sought in certain supposed inconsistencies of details, such as the alleged reference in 19^{17} (but see n. there) to Job's children as still living, or of general attitude and purpose (but see §§ 32 ff.). But whether the author was content to provide his dialogue with a ready-made setting, which, according to the exponents of this theory, was incongruous and out of harmony with his own purpose, or whether he moulded the more plastic material of oral story to his own purpose, the work in either case as it left his hands consisted of Prologue, Dialogue and Epilogue. We have next to inquire how far this work has been affected by subsequent expansion, mutilation or other modification.

§ 21. Apart from shorter passages,[1] which have been suspected of being additions to the original text, but which, even if such, do not affect the general structure of the work, there are two sections which are or have been under suspicion of being in whole or in part additions, and a third which has probably been in some way seriously modified.[2] The sections in question are:

[1] See particularly the commentary on 7^{8} 10^{20} 11^{6c} $12^{3b. 4-12}$ 15^{20a} 16^{9c-11} 17^{8-10} $20^{16. 29a}$ 21^{22} $22^{17f.}$ $23^{8f.}$ 24 (introductory note).

[2] Reference may also be made here to the theory that the scenes in heaven (1^{6-11} 2^{1-7a}) are additions to the original Prologue (so, *e.g.*, Kön. *Einl.* 415): certainly 1^{13} connects formally in a certain respect (see n. on 1^{13}) even better with 1^{5} than with 1^{12}, and by reading "And *Yahweh* smote" in 2^{7b} this might attach though rather abruptly to 1^{22}. But a theory which on inadequate grounds destroys, as this does, the dramatic effectiveness of the Prologue is not to be accepted.

(*a*) Cc. 25–28, the conclusion of the third cycle of speeches; (*b*) Cc. 32–37, Elihu; (*c*) Cc. 38^{1}–42^{6}, the speeches of Yahweh.

(*a*) Cc. 25–28.[1]—Down to 24 the interchange of speeches has proceeded quite regularly, a speech of one of the friends, ranging in length from 19 to 34 distichs, receiving in reply a speech of Job, in every case longer and in the present probably expanded text of cc. 12–14 much longer. Each of the friends has spoken twice: Eliphaz has also spoken a third time and received Job's reply. After c. 28 there follows a speech of Job (29–31) which, like his opening speech (3), is neither addressed to, nor takes any account of, the friends, though, unlike 3, it is in part, though a very small part, addressed to God (30^{20-23}). Thus the conclusion of the dialogue proper is to be sought in or within 25–28, or rather 25–27, for 28 is, as a quiet impersonal description of Wisdom, differing from the Dialogue in its use of the divine names (§ 19) and for various reasons discussed in the commentary, best regarded as an independent poem, which formed no part of the original work.

Now 25–27 at present contain a brief speech of Bildad (25^{2-6}, consisting of 5 distichs only as against the 19 distichs of the shortest of the preceding speeches, viz. Ṣophar's first speech), and one longer speech (of about 35 distiches), or rather (cp. 27^{1}) of two shorter speeches (of about 13 and 22 distichs respectively), addressed by Job to Bildad in particular (26^{2-4}), or, like Job's previous speeches, to the three friends in common (27^{2-6}). In the brevity of Bildad's third speech and the absence of the attribution of any third speech to Ṣophar, it has frequently been held that the poet provided a formal indication that the friends had exhausted their arguments and thrown up their case. This explanation might be more favourably entertained, if everything else in 22–27 containing the third cycle of speeches were in order; but this is not so. Even in c. 24, as is pointed out in the commentary, there is more or less matter that fits ill in a speech of Job: in 26 f. there is much more: and indeed we may analyse 26 f. into (1) matter appropriate to a speech of

[1] Cp. G. A. Barton, "The Composition of Job 24–30," in *JBLit.*, 1911, 66 ff.

Job's and inappropriate to a speech of one of the friends—$27^{2-6. (11) 12}$; (2) matter inappropriate (for opinions to the contrary, see the commentary) to a speech of Job, but appropriate to the friends—$27^{7-10. 13-23}$; and (3) neutral matter, *i.e.* matter not inappropriate either in Job or the friends—$26^{2-4. 5-14}$. Now (2) has been by some (Stu. Bernstein, We. Sgf. Kue.) dismissed as consisting of interpolations; but, since so regarded they are entirely suitable, it is far more probable that these passages are contributions to the third round of the debate by Bildad and Ṣophar. In this case 25–27 should contain in whole or in part Bildad's third speech and Job's reply to it, and Ṣophar's third speech and (unless, as indeed might well be, the monologue in 29–31 takes the place of this) Job's reply to Ṣophar—in all four or, at least, three speeches. But from the limited extent of these chapters we must conclude that part only and not the whole of these four (or three) speeches survive.

The three cc. contain the equivalent of about 40 distichs, whereas four speeches equalling in length only the shortest of the preceding speeches of Job, Bildad and Ṣophar would amount to about 95, three speeches to about 70 distichs. By assigning to Job all the neutral in addition to the positively appropriate matter, 20 distichs can be obtained for him which would perhaps suffice for one speech (his shortest previous speech ran to 28 distichs) though certainly not for two; but in this case there remain only 20 distichs to be distributed among Bildad and Ṣophar which are far too few. On the other hand, if the neutral matter be assigned to Bildad and Ṣophar, even then there is scarcely enough to bring up their speeches to even approximately normal length; and the effect is to leave only 7 distichs in all to Job—altogether insufficient for his reply to Bildad alone, even if 29–31 may be regarded as taking the place of any reply to Ṣophar.

The probability is great, not that to the third cycle Ṣophar contributed nothing and Bildad less than half a dozen distichs, but that the speeches of the third cycle have through some accident reached us in a very imperfect form, part of them having been lost, the remainder dislocated. This single hypothesis of mutilation of the text accounts at once for the whole of the peculiarities of the existing close of the third cycle—the brevity of Bildad's speech, the absence of Ṣophar's, the utterance by Job of matter contradicting his own and in harmony with previous utterances of Bildad and Ṣophar, and the attri-

bution to Job of *two* formal openings (26^{2-4} 27^{2-6}) in reply to a single speech—the brief words of Bildad.

But if there has been serious loss and dislocation of matter, the data for any complete or certain reconstruction of the third cycle do not exist. We cannot determine, for example, whether the loss has affected the speeches of Ṣophar and Bildad equally, whether Ṣophar's speech was wholly lost while most of Bildad's survives, or whether most of Ṣophar's but only a mere fragment of Bildad's has survived. The main point is to recognize that the passages inappropriate in the mouth of Job formed no part of his speech in the original poem.

Under these circumstances it may suffice to record, without entering into particular criticism of them, some of the reconstructions which have been attempted. Most of those who find any of Ṣophar's speech find it in 27^{7-23} to which Grätz (*Monatsschrift*, 1872, pp. 241–250) adds c. 28 as a development of Ṣophar's standpoint in 11^{5-10}. Marshall exceptionally attributes 25^{2-6} 26^{5-14} to Ṣophar; and Bi. (1894) $27^{7-10.\ 14-20}$. Among the reconstructions offered of Bildad's speech are the following:—(1) 25 + 28 (Stuhlmann, 1804); (2) 25 + 26^{5-14} Elzas, *The Book of Job* (1872), p. 83, cited by Che. *Book of Job*, p. 114, n. 1; Che. *ib.* (in *EBi.* 2478 he regards these vv. as substituted for a lost third speech of Bildad); Reuss, Sgf.; (3) $26^{2-4}+25^{2-6}$ 26^{5-14} (Du.); (4) $25^{2.\ 3}+26^{5-14}$, Peake; (5) 15^{17-19} 25^{4-6}, Honth.; (6) 25. 24^{13-25}, Hoffm.; (7) 25. 24^{18-20} 27^{13-23}, Ley; (8) 24^{18-21}, Marshall; (9) 25. $27^{8-10.\ 13-23}$, Bi. (1882); but, in 1894, $25^{2.\ 3}$ $26^{12.\ 13.\ 14c}$ 25^{4-6}.

§ **22.** (*b*) Cc. 32–37. Elihu.—These cc. consist of a brief introduction in prose (32^{1-6}), and a long speech or series of speeches in verse delivered by Elihu. The cc. were obviously written to occupy their present position in the book: as 32^{1-6} explains, Elihu speaks when the three friends had ceased to reply to Job; and in the speeches Elihu rebukes Job and the friends alike; and from Job's previous speeches he cites actual words, or summarizes statements in them (p. 278), in order to refute them. But it is scarcely less obvious that the rest of the book was not written with any knowledge of these speeches; and consequently that they formed no part of the original work. In contrast to Elihu's frequent direct reference to the friends and to Job, there is no reference, direct or indirect, in any other part of the book to Elihu; the Prologue gives the setting for the debate that follows, and explains how the three

friends who subsequently take part in it come to be present, but it says nothing of Elihu, and the special prose introduction to Elihu's speeches only partially supplies the omission; it gives a reason why Elihu speaks, it gives no reason why he is present. Neither Job nor the friends take the slightest notice of Elihu's attacks on them, or of his arguments; his speech is of greater length than any that have gone before, but no one interrupts him while he is speaking, no one has a word to say of or to him when he has done. Job's last speech closes with an appeal to God to answer him ($31^{35ff.}$), and Yahweh's reply opens (38^{2}) with words obviously addressed to the person who has just finished speaking; since this cannot be Elihu but must be Job, Yahweh's opening admits of no intervening speech of Elihu. Finally, in the Epilogue Yahweh expresses a judgement on what Job has said and what the three friends have said, but makes not the slightest reference to Elihu. Thus this entire section can be removed from the book without any sense of loss or imperfection in its construction being created.

But the speeches are not only superfluous, they are also destructive of the effect of what follows. They are superfluous, because they add nothing substantial to what the friends have said except in so far as they anticipate what Yahweh is to say; they fail, as those speeches had failed, to meet Job's case. They repeat arguments, and even words of the friends (see $33^{9. 19. 26}$ $34^{7. 8-11. 21f.}$ 35^{5-7} with nn. there). But they also anticipate (32^{27}–37^{21}) in part what Yahweh says (38^{4-38})—a fact which is entirely explained, if the writer had before him or in his mind the whole book, the speech(es) of Yahweh equally with those of the friends, but most unnaturally if they were the work of the original author who intended Yahweh's speech to round off the debate.

§ 23. Further in the style and language of these chapters there is, in spite of very much that is common to,[1] much that

[1] See Bu. *Beiträge*, 92–123; W. Posselt, *Der Verfasser d. Elihu Reden* (1909), 67–111. The common features are the natural result of the familiarity of the writer with the book which he was supplementing; so, *e.g.*, he naturally uses the same names for God, but (see § 24) with differing relative frequency.

is notably different from the rest of the book, alike in the verbose prose of 32^{1-6} as compared with the Prologue, and in the poetry of the speeches as compared with the other speeches in the book. Some differentiation in the style and even in vocabulary (Eliphaz, for example, alone uses יראה in the sense of religion, 4^6 n.) might be attributed to dramatic differentiation: and we might seek to explain the prolixity of these speeches as a dramatist's indication that the speaker is a wise young man who is conscious of possessing much more wisdom than his elders, and makes up for lack of real contribution to a discussion by the abundance and violence of his speech; and yet such an explanation, however consonant with the impression made on many readers by Elihu's speeches, is not true to the writer's own intention (see on 32^{6-22}). And in any case there remains much which cannot be attributed to dramatic differentiation, and which, *in the mass*, is most reasonably attributed to diversity of authorship.

§ **24.** (1) Elihu shows a marked relative preference for אל, using this term more frequently than all other terms for God together, whereas in the Dialogue אלוה is used with the same frequency, and שדי also frequently (§ 18).

Naturally enough even in the Dialogue the relative frequency of the three terms differs in different groups of cc.; but never does the difference in any six consecutive cc. equal that found in the six cc. of Elihu's speech; and the occurrences in Bildad's speeches are too few for a safe comparison. The following table will serve to bring out the differences:

Occurrences in	אל	אלוה	שדי
Elihu	19	6	6
Rest of the Book	36	35	25
Job's Speeches down to c. 24 .	10	17	7
Cc. 26–31	7	7	7
Eliphaz's Speeches . . .	8	6	7
Bildad's ,, . . .	6	0	2
Ṣophar's ,, . . .	2	3	1
Cc. 3–8	5	8	5
,, 9–14	5	7	2
,, 15–20	9	6	1

The net result of Bu.'s additions and omissions is to reduce the occurrences of אלוה and שדי by one each. He adds אל in 32^{8} 33^{27} and omits 33^{4} 36^{26} containing אל, 35^{4} containing שדי, and 37^{15} containing אלוה (also 34^{9} containing אלהים).

Throughout the Dialogue the three names are used without marked preference for any one of them, a more frequent use of one of them, in say a dozen occurrences of all three being balanced by a more frequent use of the others in the following passage: note these most striking cases: in cc. 3–7 אל, אלוה, שדי occur—1, 8, 3 times respectively, in c. 8—4, 0, 2; in cc. 9–11—1, 5, 1; in cc. 12–15—8, 3, 2; in c. 22—3, 2, 5. One consideration governing the choice of the names may be noted: where in each line of a distich a divine name is used (often the parallelism, if expressed at all, is expressed by means of a pronoun), a marked preference is shown for שדי as one of the two: this is true of all parts of the book: in Elihu שדי occurs four times in parallelism with another divine term, twice at most not in such parallelism; in the rest of the book it occurs 17 times in, 8 times not in parallelism with another term. On the other hand, אל occurs in Elihu 15 times not in parallelism against 4 times in parallelism, and in the rest of the book 23 times not in parallelism against 13 times in parallelism. Thus the relative infrequency of שדי in Elihu's speeches is but another side of a difference between those speeches and the rest of the book: in Elihu a single divine name with no expressed parallel is a more frequent occurrence than elsewhere. Finally, when but a single name is used, Elihu shows a very marked preference for אל (אל, 15; אלוה, 6), the rest of the book a slight preference for אלוה (אל, 23; אלוה, 27).

§ 25. (2) Elihu shows a decidedly increased preference for אני rather than אנכי.

The occurrences of the two forms of the 1st pers. pronoun in various parts of the book is as follows:

	אני	אנכי
Prologue	4	0
Dialogue	15	11
Yahweh (40^{14})	1	0
42^{4} (=21^{3a})	0	1
Elihu	9	2

To avoid either over- or under-emphasizing the significance of the figures, a closer analysis of the usage is needed. Increased preponderance of אני over אנכי, in so far as it is due to the age of the writing, is due to lateness (Dr. *LOT* 155 n.). The four occurrences of אני in the Prologue would therefore be striking, if they were really four; but they are merely the four-times repeated phrase ואמלטה רק אני לבדי, where אני follows a particle as it frequently does in both the Dialogue and Elihu. Too slight again is the use in 40^{14} and 42^{4} (a virtual quotation of 21^{3}) to throw light on either the age or authorship of these passages.

As between the Dialogue and Elihu, while some of the difference might be otherwise explained, some of it is most reasonably attributed to the difference of authorship and the somewhat later date of cc. 32–37. One occurrence of אנכי in the Dialogue is due to a repetition ($12^{3} = 13^{2}$) probably not in the original text; another is open to some doubt (see phil. n. on 21^{4} where 𝔖 omits אנכי). So also one occurrence of אני (9^{21}) may be secondary. Similarly in Elihu one occurrence of אני occurs in a repetition ($32^{10b = 17b}$). Allowing for these textual uncertainties the ratio in the Dialogue is 14 : 9, in Elihu 8 : 2. Both agree in using both forms for the prefixed subj. of a vb.: so in Elihu אני אשיבך 35^{4}, but החרש ואנכי אדבר 33^{31} (cp. 21^{3}); in the Dialogue אני ראיתי 5^{3} and so, though always after ו or other particles, and, except in 19^{25}, with the impf., 5^{8} 6^{24} 7^{11} $13^{3.18}$ $19^{25.27}$, but שאוני ואנכי אדבר 21^{3} and with preceding ו or other particle 9^{14} 13^{22} 14^{15} 16^{4}, and without preceding ו, 9^{20}. As the subj. of a non-verbal pred., Elihu uses אני in 33^{9a} 32^{6}, אנכי only in 33^{9b}, where desire for a variation in a parallel line may account for the use of the (with Elihu) very infrequent form; the Dialogue so uses אני in 7^{12} 9^{20} ($=^{21}$) 29^{15}, but with equal frequency אנכי 9^{29} 12^{3} ($= 13^{2}$) 29^{16}. After particles (other than ו), while Elihu uses אני exclusively (אף אני $32^{10b\,(=17b)\,17a}$, הן אני 33^{6}, גם אני 33^{6}, ולא אני 34^{33}), the Dialogue uses both (אולם אני 5^{8} 13^{3}, גם אני 7^{11} 13^{2} כי אני 13^{18}, ולא אני 15^{6}, אשר אני 19^{27}, and אף כי אנכי 9^{14}, גם אנכי 16^{4}, האנכי 21^{4} (?)). In particular, the contrast is interesting between גם אנכי ככם אדברה 16^{4} and הן אני כפיך לאל 33^{6}. To sum up; whereas in the Dialogue אנכי is a frequent alternative to אני, in Elihu אנכי occurs only in 33^{31}, a reminiscence of 21^{3}, and in 33^{9b} where אנכי is a parallel term to אני in 33^{9a}.

§ 26. (3) Similarly Elihu makes distinctly less use of certain rarer forms of particles and pronominal suffixes.

No doubt several of these forms occur too infrequently to have separately much or any significance. But the significance of the whole group is hardly to be cancelled by the considerations which Bu. and Posselt have brought forward. The usages may be tabulated thus:

Occurrences of	In Elihu (E).	Rest of Job (R).	Rest of OT.
{ אֱלֵי (6^{5} 7^{1} nn.)[1] . .	2	13	25
{ עֲדֵי	0	2 (7^{4} 20^{5})	10 (*Isaiah*, p. 467)
{ עֲלֵי	0	4[2]	0
{ בְּמוֹ[3]	1	3 (4)	4 (5)
{ כְּמוֹ	0	11[4]	32
{ לְמוֹ	0[5]	4[6]	0
מִנִּי[7]	3	16	13
בְּלִי[8] (without prefix) .	2	8	11
{ לָמוֹ[9]	0	10	45
{ עָלֵימוֹ[10]	0	8	4

§ 27. (4) In certain cases E expresses ideas common to himself and R by different terms: *e.g.* יֵשַׁע (p. *234*), תְּמִים (except in E, only in the probably interpolated v. 12^{4}) in lieu of תָּם (p. 3), נֹעַר in lieu of נְעֻרִים (p. *250*). Cp. also 32^{1} n., 33^{1} n., and the phil. nn. on מענה 32^{3}, פֹּעֲלִי 36^{3} (ct. עֹשֵׂנִי 31^{15}), ירשיע 34^{12}. Note also that E always uses אֱנוֹשׁ in phrases of the type א׳ רֶשַׁע ($34^{8.10.34.36}$: in 37^{7} the text is probably corrupt), whereas elsewhere in such phrases מְתֵי is always employed (11^{11} 19^{19} 22^{15} 31^{31}).

[1] The occurrences in Job are in 6^{5} 7^{1} (Qre) 8^{9} 9^{26} 15^{27} 16^{15} 18^{10} 20^{4} $29^{2.4.7}$ 38^{24} 41^{22} | 33^{15} 36^{28}. Add perhaps 31^{21} (l. עלי תם). Cp. the occurrences of עַל in the poetical parts of the book: R 48+12 (ועל), E 15+1 (ועל). Note further in R עדי and אלי always, and עלי, except in four cases (16^{15} 18^{10} $29^{2.4}$), occur before a tone syllable (7^{1} n.): both cases in E are before toneless syllables (33^{15} 36^{28}). עד occurs R 21, E 2 (32^{11} 34^{36} עד נצח); אל R 22, E 5.

[2] 3^{22} 5^{26} 15^{22} 29^{19}.

[3] (9^{30}) $16^{4.5}$ 19^{16} | 37^{8}, Is. (25^{10}) 43^{2} $44^{16.19}$, Ps. 11^{2}.

[4] 6^{15} $10^{22\text{ bis}}$ 12^{3} 14^{9} 19^{29} 28^{5} 31^{37} 38^{14} 40^{17} 41^{16}.

[5] There would be one occurrence in E, if in 33^{23} we read לְמ מתים.

[6] 27^{14} 29^{21} 38^{40} 40^{4}.

[7] 6^{16} 7^{6} $9^{2.26}$ 11^{8} 12^{22} 14^{11} $15^{22.30}$ 16^{16} 18^{17} $20^{4\text{ bis}}$ 28^{4} 30^{30} 31^{7} | $33^{18.22.30}$.

[8] 8^{11} 24^{10} 30^{8} 31^{39} 38^{2} 39^{16} 41^{18} 42^{3} | 33^{9} 34^{6}.

[9] 3^{14} 6^{19} 14^{21} 15^{28} $22^{17.19}$ $24^{16.17}$ 30^{13} 39^{4}. Against these ten occurrences of למו there are in E 1, in R 4 cases of להם: Mandelkern, *Concord. Minor*, 811 f.

[10] Three (20^{23} 22^{2} 27^{23}: cp. also 18^{20} 𝔊: see nn. on the passages), if the text is correct = עליו (which occurs in E 4, in R 20 times): five times (6^{16} 21^{17} $30^{2.5}$ 29^{22}) = עליהם (which occurs once in E, twice in R). Statistics based on Mandelkern, *Concord. Minor*, 528, 529. Note also כמימו, 27^{23}, G-K. 91*l*.

§ 28. (5) In common with R, E contains a number of Aramaisms;[1] but, though this feature has been on the one hand exaggerated, on the other minimized, in E the Aramaic element is somewhat more prominent. Since in detail there is much that is open in varying degrees to uncertainty, exact statistics cannot usefully be presented; but of 32 Aramaisms which Kautzsch (*Die Aramäismen im alten Testament*, p. 101) claims in Job, 5 are common to E and R, 8 peculiar to E, 19 peculiar to R, whereas the ratio of E to R (1 : 6) would lead us to expect but three peculiar to E. I now give the Aramaisms claimed as certain by Kautzsch with the passages under which the words are discussed in the philological notes, and then add a few from Kautzsch's list of uncertain Aramaisms or elsewhere. Most of the words in question occur but once in Job; of those that occur more frequently I place the number of occurrences after the word. I prefix a ? to certain words open to doubt textually or as to their actual Aramaic character, and give references to Nöldeke's criticism in his important review of Kautzsch (*ZDMG* lvii. 412–420: cited below as N with the number of the page).

Common to E and R are אלף (Piel *to teach*, 15^{5} 33^{33} 35^{11}: Qal *to learn*, Pr. $22^{25\dagger}$: in 𝔗𝔖 = Heb. למד), חוה (R 1, E 4) 15^{17},[2] מלל[3] (R 1, E 1) 8^{2}, מלה[3] (R 20, E 14) 4^{2}, שנא, שנה (R 2 + 1, E 1) 8^{7}.

Peculiar to R are אחוה 13^{17},[2] ? הן, *if*,[4] חרה 3^{6}, טוש 9^{26}, ? טפל (2)[5]

[1] On the Aramaisms in Job, cp. in addition to the works cited above and those of Bu. and Posselt cited in § 23 n., Bernstein, "Inhalt, Zweck u. gegenwärtige Beschaffenheit des B. Hiob," in Keil u. Tzschirner's *Analekten* (1813), i. 3, pp. 49–79; Che. *Job and Solomon*, 293–295, in many respects modified in *EBi.* 2486 f.

[2] Che. (*EBi.* 2487) omits 15^{17} and 13^{17}, thus leaving the root חוה confined to E.

[3] N. 413 claims מלל, מלה as "echt hebräisch." In Job מלה is a synonym of דבר and אמר: it is relatively more frequent in E (מלה, 14; אמר, 4; דבר: 4: R מלה, 20; אמר, 6; דבר, 12). For the Aramaizing pl. (but see N. 413, n. 2) מלין, E has a preference, using it 7 times against מלים 3 times; R מלין 6, מלים 7 times.

[4] Kautzsch claims 6 occurrences—$9^{11f.}$ $12^{14f.}$ 23^{8} 40^{23}; but see 9^{12} n., where Dr. admits at most 9^{12} 40^{23}: cp. N. 416.

[5] N. 415.

13^{4}, יקר, *glorious* 31^{26}, כֵּף (2) 30^{6}, כפן (2) 5^{22}, ?? להן, *therefore* 30^{24}, ? מכך[1] 24^{24}, נחת,[2] *to descend* 21^{13} (17^{16}), ערוד[3] 39^{5}, עתק 21^{7}, ? עשתות 12^{5}, קבל (2) 2^{10}, קרב,[4] *war* 38^{23}, שהד 16^{19}, ? שרירים 40^{16}, תקף 14^{20}.

Peculiar to E are ? בחר 34^{4}, חף[5] 33^{9}, כתר 36^{2}, מעבד 34^{25}, עקב (= עכב)[6] 37^{4}, רעע (= רצץ) 34^{24}, שגיא (2) 36^{26}, שרה 37^{3}.

Other words which should also probably be considered Aramaisms are אכף 33^{7}, קטל 13^{15} 24^{14} ("probably Aramaic," N. 417), and שלהבת 15^{30} (N. 417)—*i.e.* one word only in E, two only in R. רקב in 13^{28}, if it meant *wine-skin* (Be.; Nestle, *ZATW* xx. 172; Che. *EBi.* 2487), would also be an Aramaism, but מאס 7^{5}, cited by Kautzsch in his doubtful examples, may be disregarded.

§ 29. (6) As important as the details which can be statistically presented is the general impression of the style. "The *style* of Elihu . . . is prolix, laboured and somewhat tautologous ($32^{6\text{ end}.\,10b.\,17b}$): the power and brilliancy which are so conspicuous in the poem generally are sensibly missing. The reader, as he passes from Job and his three friends to Elihu, is conscious at once that he has before him the work of a writer, not indeed devoid of literary skill, but certainly inferior in literary and poetical genius to the author of the rest of the book. The language is often involved and the thought strained" (Dr. *LOT* 429). With this view Bu., who in his *Beiträge* offered the most elaborate defence of the identity of style in cc. 32–37 and the rest of the book, now practically concurs (Comm. xix.[2] xxvii.): but he attributes this diversity of style in the section as a whole to the interpolation of some 30 verses ($32^{2-5.\,11-12.\,15-17}$ $33^{4.\,15b.\,33}$ $34^{9.\,10a.\,25-28.\,29c}$ 35^{4} $36^{13.\,14.\,17.\,25.\,26.\,29.\,30}$ $37^{13.\,15.\,16}$) and much corruption of the text. Some of the harshness and obscurity is certainly due to corruption (see on 33^{21} $34^{20.\,29-33}$ 36^{33}), and some interpolation there may have

[1] N. 414. [2] N. 414 "kann althebräisch sein."

[3] N. 413—perhaps a good Hebrew synonym of פרא.

[4] N. 413 f.: traditional Aramaic *punctuation* קְרָב not necessarily correct.

[5] N. 415 points out that the meaning required in 33^{9} does not occur in Aramaic.

[6] In addition to the n. on 37^{3}, cp. Rothstein in *ZDMG* lvii. 82.

been (*e.g.*, perhaps in 34^{25} $36^{26.\,29-30}$) here, as elsewhere in the book; but it is in general improbable that these chapters have been *more* extensively interpolated than the rest, and in particular there is no sufficient reason for regarding as interpolations most of the passages omitted by Bu. The assumption again, that the omissions of 𝕲 represent additions to the original text, is as precarious here as elsewhere (see § 50). A different theory of diversity of authorship within 32–37 is put forward by Nichols, who distinguishes 32^{11-16} 34. $35^{15.\,16}$ (placed between 34^{27} and ^{34}) as the words of a "second wise man" addressed not at all to Job (34^{16} is omitted, and with 𝕲 34^{28-33}), but throughout to the wise; the style of both authors in 32–37 is held to differ from that of the rest of the book.

The various reasons already given, independently of considerations adduced in § 32 ff., suffice to show that cc. 32–37 are the work of another writer than the author of the book.

§ 30. (*c*) Cc. 38^{1}–42^{6}, the speech(es) of Yahweh.

The only ground for questioning this section as a whole lies in the nature of the contents which have appeared to some incapable of reconciliation with the standpoint of the author of the Dialogue. This will be discussed below (§§ 38–39). Apart from this everything is in favour of the main part of the section having formed part of the original work. The speeches of Elihu may be removed without causing a tremor to the structure of the book; but without some speech of Yahweh the structure falls to pieces. The book as a finished structure can never have closed with c. 31 (or 37); a speech of Yahweh is the natural, if not the necessary sequel to Job's closing soliloquy; and a speech of Yahweh is certainly presupposed in the opening words of the Epilogue (42^{7}). Thus there are three alternatives: (1) the speech is authentic; (2) the original author left his work unfinished, and a subsequent writer added the speech of Yahweh; (3) the present has been substituted for a speech in the original work. In either of the last two alternatives we might expect difference of style; but such difference, if it can be detected at all, does not extend beyond 40^{6}–$41^{34\,(26)}$. Cc. 38 f. at least are by general consent un-

surpassed for poetical power. On the whole, then, 38. 39 together with 40^{2-5} and 42^{2-6} appear to be integral to the book, but 40^{6}–42^{1} for reasons given in the commentary (pp. 348 f., 351 f.) are probably later additions.

§ 31. The conclusions on the main questions now reached, and those on minor details indicated in the commentary, may be tabulated so as to indicate the original structure of the book and additions which at various times it may have received. The passages absent from 𝔊, representing (in the main) a subsequent abbreviation of the book (§ 48 f.), are also given: as omissions from 𝔊 are reckoned lines absent from 𝔏 (with half a dozen exceptions), or (in 39^{9}–40^{8}) asterisked in $𝔖^{H}$, and also 17^{16} 20^{8} (see § 49).

THE ORIGINAL STRUCTURE AND SUBSEQUENT MODIFICATIONS OF JOB

Original Elements.	Additions Probable or Possible.	Omissions in 𝔊.
1. Prologue, 1. 2		[Enumeration of vv. by Swete; where that of the translation differs from this, it is added in brackets.]
2. Job's soliloquy, 3		
3. Dialogue between the friends and Job		
First cycle of speeches		
Eliphaz, 4. 5		5^{22a}.
Job, 6. 7 except	7^{8}	7^{8}.
Bildad, 8		
Job, 9. 10 „	10^{8c}	$9^{24b.\ c}$ 10^{4a} (𝔐: $10^{4a.\ b}$ Sw. both = 10^{4b} 𝔐).
Sophar, 11 „	11^{6c}	11^{6b}.
Job, 12–14 „	$12^{3b.\ 4-13}$	$12^{8b.\ 9.\ 18b.\ 21a.\ 23}$ $13^{19b.\ 20b}$ $14^{12c.\ 18.\ 19}$.
Second cycle of speeches		
Eliphaz, 15 except	15^{30a}	$15^{10.\ 26b.\ 27}$.
Job, 16. 17 „	16^{9c-11} 17^{8-10}	$16^{3b.\ 8b.\ 9\ (7b\beta-8)\ 22\ (21)b}$. $17^{3b-5a.\ 12.\ 16}$.
Bildad, 18		$18^{9b.\ 10.\ 15}$ (but $15c$ 𝔊 = $15a$ 𝔐) $16.\ 17b$.
Job, 19		$19^{24a.\ 28b}$.
Sophar, 20 „	$20^{16.\ 23}$	$20^{3.\ 9.\ 11-13.\ 14b.\ 20b.\ 21a.\ 23a.\ 23c}$.
Job, 21 „	21^{22}	$21^{15.\ 19b.\ 21.\ 23.\ 28-33}$.

THE ORIGINAL STRUCTURE AND SUBSEQUENT MODIFICATIONS OF JOB—*continued*

ORIGINAL ELEMENTS.	ADDITIONS PROBABLE OR POSSIBLE.	OMISSIONS IN 𝔊.
3. Dialogue between the friends and Job Third cycle of speeches		
Eliphaz, 22 except	$22^{17f.}$	$22^{3b. 12-16. 20. 24. 28. 30}$.
Job, 23. 24 „	$23^{8. 9}$ and ? parts of 24 (p. 206)	$23^{9. 15 (14)}$ $24^{4b. 5c. 8a. 14-18a}$ (^{14a} Sw., cp. 34^{25} 𝔐) $^{25b\beta}$ (25b).
Bildad, 25 (+? 26)		$26^{5-11. 14a.b}$.
Job, $27^{2-6. 11. 12}$ + Ṣophar ?, $27^{7-10. 13-23}$		$27^{19b. 21-23}$.
	28 Poem on Wisdom	$28^{3b-4a. 5-9a. 14-19. 21b. 22a. 26b-27a}$.
Job's closing soliloquy, 29–31		$29^{10b. 11a}$ ($^{10a.b}$: Sw. ^{10a} = 𝔐 11a) 12a. 19. 20. 24b. 25. $30^{1c. 2. 3. 4a (?). 7a. 11b-12a. 16a. 18b. 20b. 27}$. $31^{1-4. 18. 23b. 24a. 27a. 28a}$.
	32–37 Elihu	$32^{4b. 5. 11b (11c). 12. 15. 16 (17 ?)}$. $33^{8a. 19b. 20b. 26. 29. 31b-33}$. $34^{3. 4. 6b. 7. 11b. 18b. 23a. 25b. 28-33}$. $35^{7b-10a. 12a. 15. 16}$. $36^{5b. 6. 7}$ (6a. 7b. c: 6b. 7a 𝔐 = 15b. 17a 𝔊) 8-11. 13. 16. 20. 21b. 22a. $36^{24b. 25a. 26. 27b. 28a. 29-33}$. $37^{1-5a. 6b. 7a. 10a. 11a-12c. 13. 18. 21b (c)}$.
4. Yahweh 38^1–40^2 except	39^{17} 40^6–$41^{34 (26)}$	$38^{26. 27. 32}$ $39^{1a. 3b-4. 6b. 8}$. $39^{13-18. 23. 25b. 31}$ (40^1). $40^{18 (23)b. 19 (20). 21 (26)a}$.
Job, 40^{2-5} $42^{2. 3c. d. 5. 6}$		$41^{3 (12). 7 (16)a. 8 (17). 14 (23)b. 17 (26)b. 20 (29)a. 23 (32)b}$.
5. Epilogue, 42^{7-17}		$42^{3d. 16a. 17}$.

V. THE PURPOSE AND METHOD OF THE WRITER.

§ 32. If we are right in concluding that a single writer is responsible for the Prologue, the speeches of Job, of his three friends and of Yahweh (apart from the passages indicated in the preceding table as possible additions), and the Epilogue, what was the purpose of this writer, and what are the distinctive features of his thought and outlook on life which he reveals in his work?

It would no doubt be as inadequate a description of Job, as, for example, of *Paradise Lost*, to call it merely a didactic poem; it would be even further from the truth to regard it as a purely objective dramatic poem in which the author maintains an interested but quite impartial attitude towards the various characters which are introduced and the various points of view which are expressed by them. On the other hand, the author obviously ranges himself with Yahweh in approving Job as against his friends; as passionately as Job he rejects the interpretation of life maintained by the friends, and as decisively as Yahweh the estimate of human character (so closely associated with the friends' outlook on life) that is offered by the Satan. The writer's purpose is never so directly formulated as Milton's—to

> assert Eternal Providence
> And justify the ways of God to men;

nor is it coextensive with it; but it is akin, and not really concealed, and the differences of opinion which have prevailed with regard to the purpose of the book have been due to seeking from the author more than he was able or intended to offer. He had no clear-cut theology, like Milton's, enabling him to say why God acted as He did and thus positively to justify His ways; but through pain and trial he had discovered in his own experience that God did not abandon the sufferer, and therefore he was able to assert that God did not send sufferings on men merely for the reasons commonly assigned, and that it was not necessarily or always true that as an individual suffered so he had sinned; and thus, if he could not positively justify God, he could at least vindicate Him against the ways attributed to Him by the current opinion of his time, represented in the poem by the friends. There was also another side to his experience: he had discovered not only that God did not abandon the sufferer, but also that suffering and loss had not detached him from God, that it was possible to serve and love God not for the outward things He gave, but for what He was in Himself. The book aims not at solving the entire problem of suffering, but at vindicating God and the latent worth of human nature against certain conclusions drawn from a partial observation of life.

§ 33. The book opens with the presentation of a perfect character: Job is so described in the first words of the narrative (1^1), and the truth of the description is endorsed by Yahweh (1^8 2^3); the kind of life and character thus described in general terms is indicated in detail elsewhere in the book (cp. especially c. 31: also, *e.g.*, $4^{3f.}$; and see n. on 1^1). But the Satan disputes the inherent worth of this character: Job, he insinuates, had lived as he had, not simply with the result (1^1 n.) that he had become outwardly prosperous, but in order that he might prosper; he had served God not for God's sake, but to obtain the handsome price of such service: human nature is incapable of pure devotion to God, human conduct is not disinterested; if the payment for it ceases, or becomes uncertain, man's service of God will cease, man will no longer address God reverentially, or affectionately, but blasphemingly; where love and trust had seemed to be while such qualities received their price, there hate and contempt will certainly be when the price is withdrawn. Such is the issue between Yahweh and the Satan, Yahweh upholding, the Satan calling in question, the integrity, the sincerity, the disinterestedness of Job. Such also had been the issue in the mind of the writer who wrote the speeches that follow the opening narrative; he had faced the same problem of life as Plato in the *Republic* (Bk. ii.); he had realized that the really perfect man must be prepared to prove his perfectness by maintaining it even when there befell him calamity such as would have seemed the meet sequel to wickedness, and such as actually had the effect on the ordinary judgement of men of making him seem to have been wicked though actually he had been good. The very friends of Job, held by the dogma that a man of broken fortunes cannot have been "integer vitae scelerisque purus," infer from Job's calamities that he must have been wicked, though his own conscience and God's unerring judgement assert that the life on which these calamities descended had been free from blame.

§ 34. Within the Prologue the issue is decided against the Satan: when the Satan sneeringly says to God, Take away all the wealth Thou hast given Job, then go and see him, and he

will curse Thee, he is obviously contemplating the *immediate* result of deprivation on Job; for when in the second scene in heaven he is challenged by Yahweh to admit that Job's conduct and temper under loss have proved the Satan's estimate of him wrong, he does not plead that the experiment has not had long enough to work, but claims that it is merely necessary to withdraw health as well as wealth, and Job will at once cease blessing and curse. The Satan's estimate is based on weaker characters, exemplified by Job's wife, who would have Job do what the Satan had counted on his doing; but Job himself rejects the advice of his wife in words which are tantamount to saying: to curse God now would be to prove that I have served and blessed Him hitherto not for what He is, but for the good-fortune which for so long He gave me; now that ill-fortune has befallen me I can show that I serve Him for what He is. Thus Job left at last only with bare life, without which he could be no subject of testing, and his character which had been called in question, but which he had maintained intact under the last test that the Satan could suggest, by these words proves his disinterested attachment to Yahweh, that he had not served Him for what He gave, and thus finally and completely puts the Satan in the wrong, and that so obviously that it is unreasonable, as some have done, to complain that the writer has not depicted Yahweh pressing home the Satan's discomfiture, whether by a third scene in heaven, or in the Epilogue.

Job by his attitude in the Prologue has, unknown to himself, vindicated Yahweh's against the Satan's estimate of his character; but the result of the Satan's experiments, the origin and purpose of which remain unknown on earth, is to expose Job's character to attack from another quarter. The Satan in heaven disputes the integrity of Job's character, because prosperity had necessarily left it untested: when his prosperity forsakes Job, his friends on earth dispute his integrity on the ground that he must have sinned because he no longer prospers. Thus the Prologue opens up the question of the relation of loss and suffering to sin: with this question the Dialogue is concerned, and necessarily (for it is a crucial instance for the theory at

issue) interwoven with the discussion of it is the attack on and defence of Job's integrity.

§ 35. Between Job's rebuke of his wife with its implicit assertion of his own resignation and the opening of the Dialogue some weeks intervene: in the interval Job's experience has raised questions in his own mind: why is he, why are men born to suffer? The ready answer of his old faith would have been: men are not born to suffer; they only suffer if they sin; but his experience has proved this false in his own case, and, as he is now ready to believe, it would also be false in the case of countless others, but to the bitter question he now finds no answer. Thus he goes into the following debate convinced that the solution there repeatedly put forward is false, but with no other theory to oppose to it. To these questionings of Job his three friends, who being no fair weather friends had come to him on hearing of his calamities, had listened: they had brought with them the same old faith as Job's, but not the direct personal experience which had proved to Job its inadequacy. In all friendliness they would recall Job to the faith, and lead him to the course which that faith indicated—humble acceptance of the discipline of suffering, confession and abandonment of the sin which had brought his suffering upon him, and return to God. Job cannot accept such advice, for in doing so he would be false to his conviction of his integrity. The nature of the Dialogue—so different from those of Plato—is thus determined by the nature of the difference in character of what the two parties—for the three friends constitute a single party—stand for: the friends maintain a theory, Job defends a fact—the reality and truth of his conviction of innocence. The Dialogue, therefore, is not directed towards reaching a correct or more adequate theory, but towards emphasizing the certainty of the fact and the consequent falseness of the prevailing theory. So far, indeed, is Job from opposing a different *theory* to the theory of the friends that his own outlook, and his own interpretation of what has happened, is still largely governed by the theory which he also had once unquestioningly held; and which is still the only *positive theory* to hold the field till driven from it by the vindication of the truth of Job's conviction, which proves

the theory false. Because he has no other theory of suffering than that of the friends, he can imagine no other *just* cause for his own sufferings than sin on his part; since, then, as he knows directly and for certain that such just cause does not exist, he *infers* that his suffering has been unjustly inflicted, that God—the God at least of his own old and the friends' still cherished theory—is unjustly causing his suffering, has changed without good cause from being his friend into his enemy. In the early days of his loss, Job was conscious only of his own unchanged attitude towards God; as time gives opportunity for reflection, and more especially as the friends press home the inference, inevitable under the theory, that because Job greatly suffers he must have greatly sinned, Job awakes to another aspect of his strange fortunes; loss gives him the opportunity of proving his willingness to receive from God ill-fortune no less than good fortune; of remaining, when rewards fail, for His own sake, the servant, the friend of God; but loss at the same time, if the friends and their theory are right, is God's unambiguous assertion that He has rejected Job and become his enemy. This is Job's severest trial of all—a trial the Satan failed to think of; and under the stress of it Job says much that doubtless needs correction, and yet nothing that corresponds to anything the Satan can have meant by "cursing God to His face," nothing that reflects back upon Job's previous character in such a way as to indicate that it lacked the wholeness which Yahweh claimed for it and the Satan denied. Job nowhere regrets his previous service of God, and never demands the restoration of the previous rewards; what he does seek is God Himself, God unchanged, still his friend—on his side, unestranged from him, and not, as the theory assures him He has now become, his enemy; and what he seeks he never really and permanently despairs of finding; against God, seeming by the calamities He sends to take away his character, he appeals to God to vindicate it (16^{18-21} n. 17^{3}), and rises to certainty that He will do so, if not this side death, then beyond (19^{27}); but it is only for this vindication, for the realization that God really remains his friend, not for the restoration of good fortune, that Job contemplates the intervention of God on his behalf.

§ 36. It is unnecessary to review in detail here all the speeches of the friends and Job's replies to them: they cover the same ground again and again. So far as the friends are concerned it is of the very essence of the writer's purpose that they should one and all say essentially the same thing: they are not introduced to represent many existing theories; but the three of them, expounding the same theory, represent that as the unchallenged judgement of ancient and still current opinion. All the variety that is thus possible in the friends' speeches is variety of expression, the formulation of different aspects of the same theory, or different proofs of it, such as the divine origin of it ($4^{12ff.}$ Eliphaz), its antiquity ($8^{8f.}$ Bildad, $15^{18f.}$ Eliphaz, 20^{4} Ṣophar), the impossibility, due to man's ignorance, of successfully disputing it ($11^{5ff.}$ Ṣophar), or of such subsidiary theories as had been called in to help it out. Of these a word or two may be said here. Briefly, the theory itself is that the righteous prosper, the unrighteous come to grief, and conversely that suffering implies sin in the individual sufferer, and prosperity the righteousness of the prosperous. But the facts of life at any time too obviously challenge this simplest form of theory; and these had already led to certain additional details which accordingly are not represented as elicited by the debate, but are many of them already expressed or implied in the very first speech of Eliphaz. Such details are the suggestions that all men are impure and sinful to some extent, and that therefore suffering is to some extent due to all; that righteous individuals might suffer to some extent and for a time, and unrighteous individuals might similarly prosper, but that the unrighteous did and the righteous did not come to an untimely end (*e.g.* 4^{7} 8^{16-19}); that the wicked, even when seeming to be prosperous, were haunted by terror of the coming calamity that was their due ($15^{20ff.}$). Again—and here there persists the influence of that strong sense of the solidarity of the family or clan, with its relative indifference to the individual, that preceded the increased value set on the individual, which is the presupposition of the book of Job—it is urged that even if an unrighteous man lives out a long prosperous life, his children pay the penalty for it (5^{4}

20^{10}). Or again it is conceded, especially by Eliphaz in his first speech ($5^{17ff.}$: so also Elihu, *passim*), that suffering need not be mere penalty, but may have as its end the conviction and removal of sin, the purification of character; in other words, that suffering is not only penal, but may also be disciplinary. But with all the admissions and concessions that the current theory allows them to make, the friends in the development of the debate clearly make plain that the substance of the theory is that God distributes suffering and prosperity to the unrighteous and righteous respectively, and that in proportion to their righteousness or unrighteousness. Accordingly Eliphaz, who in his first speech introduces the subject of disciplinary suffering (arguing that since no man is free from sin, all men must suffer, but that if they rightly accept suffering due to essential human infirmity, they will ultimately prosper, whereas if they prove obstinate and greatly suffer they must greatly have sinned) in his second speech[1] expresses his conviction that Job must be a peculiarly heinous sinner (15^{14-16}), and in his third speech invents charges against him of certain specific sins of great enormity (22^{6-9}), thus lying on behalf of his theory of God. Bildad and Ṣophar by dwelling in their second speeches (and Ṣophar also in his third, if this survives in 27) almost exclusively on the fate of the wicked—depicted often in colours borrowed from Job's experience—indirectly convey the same judgement that Eliphaz expresses directly.

§ 37. In his replies to the friends, Job insists on his integrity—the fact by which their theory is shattered, their advice rendered nugatory. He agrees with them as to the might of God, and as to the frailty of human nature, carrying with it proneness to sin and yielding to temptation in *all* men, himself included; that *all* should suffer raises a question (3^{20}), which, however, perplexing as it is, would be relatively intelligible and endurable; but while all men sin, men differ widely in the extent to which they sin, and yet it is those who like himself are relatively free from sin and within the limitations of human frailty perfect who suffer—not invariably, but often; and it is

[1] Cp. in Ṣophar's very first speech, 11^{6c}; but the line is probably not original.

the wicked who prosper—not again invariably, but often, so that it may be said that God sends suffering indifferently on the perfect and the wicked (9^{22-24}). *If*, then, suffering is always punishment, God is an unjust judge, inflicting punishment where it is not due, and failing to secure its infliction where it is due. Nor again will the plea of the friends do, that Job's sufferings are sent in kindness by God to deflect him from his wicked way, and so even yet secure an end of life richer and more amply blessed than even his earlier life had been: Job has no wicked way to be deflected from, as his own conscience attests and God Himself—though this, of course, is unknown to Job and the friends—has insisted. Starting from the same point—that all suffering is penal—Job and the friends thus reach different conclusions—he, with eyes opened to the facts of life but himself not yet rid of the theory, concluding that God is unjust ($9^{15ff.}$ 19^{6}) though mighty ($9^{2ff.}$ 12^{13-25}), not only letting Job suffer, but letting the wicked enjoy life to the full and to the end (c. 21), they, distorting or blind to facts, that God is both mighty and just. This is a sufficiently clear-cut difference. But Job is also at issue with himself. The old *theory* leads inevitably to the conclusion that God is unjust, but the old *experience* of God still prompts him to trust God as being good as well as mighty. So long as the theory dominates him, he can only wish and pray that this mighty unjust God would leave him alone, cease to think it worth His while to continue to torment him (7^{17-21} 10^{20} 19^{22}); but when the old experience of God ($29^{2ff.}$) reasserts its influence, what he longs for is that God should again speak to him, recognize him (14^{15}), yearn for him (7^{21d}), admit his innocence and even vindicate it against (16^{18}–17 19^{25-27}) His own charges, made in the language of misfortune, that he has sinned, and so far from being perfect is one of the most imperfect and wicked of men.

§ 38. The double issue—that of Job with the friends, and that of Job with himself—should be determined when God intervenes; and if we have rightly analysed these issues, in the speeches of Yahweh—less directly, perhaps, than we might at first expect—and in the Epilogue, these issues are determined. Certainly the speech of Yahweh does not contain what

Job had not demanded, a positive theory of the meaning or purpose of suffering—and doubtless for the very good reason that the author himself had no such theory; had he had, he would probably have represented Job discovering this theory through suffering, and God at last approving Job's theory as against that of the friends; as it is, he is content to make clear the truth of Job's and the falseness of the friends' assertion as to the fact of Job's integrity. What Job had demanded was that God should formulate the charges of sin for which his sufferings had been sent; and to this God replies in the only possible way (cp. 1^8) by formulating no such charge. The speech of Yahweh contains a charge, it is true; but it is a charge of a different kind; and the Epilogue in the most direct terms pronounces Job in the right and the friends in the wrong. Are the speech with its charge and the Epilogue with its vindication at variance with one another? In particular, does the speech condemn where the Epilogue acquits Job? There certainly is a difference of judgement; but is it on the same issue? When, in the opening words of His speech, Yahweh asks: Who is this that darkeneth the purpose (of God) with words spoken without knowledge, He is certainly under the form of a question definitely charging Job with having spoken ignorantly and misleadingly about God, and this Job in his response admits (42^3). On the other hand, in the Epilogue Yahweh directly asserts that Job has said what was right, and the friends what was wrong about God. Is the one a condemnation, the other an acquittal *on the same charge*? In attempting a reply to this question, it is necessary to take into account the speech of Yahweh as a whole, and to observe what it does not contain as well as what it does. What the speech does not contain is singularly important; for its silence is a tacit repetition of the judgement challenged by the Satan in the Prologue, an anticipation of the vindication of Job against the friends expressed in the Epilogue, and a justification of one of Job's two thoughts of God against the other. The speech in no way goes back on Yahweh's judgement in the Prologue; it does not in the slightest degree admit the justice of the Satan's impugnment of the inner springs, or the friends' impugnment of the outward

elements of Job's conduct before his sufferings came upon him: it does not, as Job had at times feared, show God, when He appears, unjustly treating him as and pronouncing him guilty of sins such as could account for his sufferings. Thus the speech tacitly confirms the voice of Job's conscience, that his life had been free from blame. The condemnation implied in the opening and closing words (38^2 40^2) of the speech is of Job's criticism of God's ways, not as they actually were, but as they would have been if the theory of suffering being always and merely penal were true; in other words, it is a condemnation of something that had taken place *after* the calamity had befallen Job, of something consequently that was not the cause of that suffering. It is at the same time a condemnation of the theory persistently maintained by the friends and only half abandoned by Job himself; for that theory implied a claim to an extent of acquaintance with God's ways which it is the purpose of the speech to show that man did not possess. For the rest, the speech is directed towards illustrating the marvellous range of Yahweh's activities, the innumerable elements, inexplicable by man, in His ways. In certain respects this may seem irrelevant: Job no less than the friends had acknowledged that God's ways were past finding out; but Job in charging God with injustice had made use of the old theory that implicitly laid claim to a complete knowledge of God's ways with men; Job's acknowledgment of fault (42^{3-6}) is accordingly limited to the confession that he had spoken beyond his knowledge.

§ 39. But the speech of Yahweh accompanies an appearance or direct manifestation of Yahweh to Job, and in this respect is the direct response of Yahweh to Job's deepest desire: Job has at last found Yahweh; and, in spite of the rebuke of his words beyond knowledge, he has found Yahweh on his side, no more estranged from him than in the days of his former prosperity, but more intimately known; as compared with his former, his present knowledge is as sight to hearing, as direct, first hand personal to second hand and traditional knowledge. So far from his earlier sense of God's friendship having been shown by his sufferings to be a delusion, its reality has been vindicated,

and by God's response to his appeal his communion with God has been intensified.

So we may relate the speech and the accompanying manifestation of God to the purpose of the book; but inasmuch as that speech had to condemn the theory without putting another in its place and to criticize Job for continuing to make use of it, even when his own experience was showing that it had broken down, for the sake of clearness at least it was essential that the book should close with an unequivocal reassertion of what God had asserted in the Prologue, and the Satan there and the friends in the Debate had denied —the integrity of the man on whom the great sufferings had fallen. This is reasserted in two ways, both of which leave nothing lacking in the explicitness of the assertion. In the first place, Yahweh in the Epilogue directly pronounces Job to have been in the right, the friends to have been in the wrong; but there is one remarkable aspect of Yahweh's words: what He says is that Job has spoken truly and the friends falsely *about Him*: in this there is, so far as the judgement on Job is concerned, an apparent divergence from the condemnatory questions in 38^2 40^2; but in God's speech to Job there was no reference to what the friends had said of Him; and it is this that stands first in the Epilogue and carries with it the judgement on Job's words, which if it stood alone unlimited by the context would perhaps be irreconcilable with 38^2 40^2. It is true, Yahweh might have said expressly that the friends falsely deny, and Job rightly asserts his innocence; but this in itself would only indirectly have indicated the falseness of the friends' *theory of God* in relation to human suffering, which it is, as we have seen, a main purpose of the writer to assert; he has therefore preferred to present Yahweh's judgement on Job and the friends in a form of words which directly asserts that the friends have spoken wrongly about God, and that in the point where they have been wrong Job has been right; in inventing charges against Job they have told lies to maintain their theory of God; in repudiating these charges and denying that his calamities are God's accusation of wickedness in him, Job has spoken right.

§ 40. Not only does Yahweh thus expressly assert Job's

integrity of character, He also marks it by renewed and increased outward tokens of His favour. This aspect of the Epilogue has often been judged unworthy of the author of the poem, and really inconsistent with his purpose of maintaining the possible disinterestedness of human conduct, and a virtual giving of the case away to the friends on the ground that Job's fate illustrates afresh the formula that the righteous can only suffer for their sins for a time and must ultimately prosper. But the two points are not quite rightly taken. If the double prosperity of Job's latter days had been the price he demanded for continued service of God, the objection would hold; but it was not: and what Job had demanded was something very different—the vindication of his character. Again the restoration to fortune falls not after any confession on the part of Job of sins which had caused his sufferings, as Eliphaz had led him to expect that it might, but immediately after the judgement of God that Job the sufferer has far surpassed the friends who had not suffered, in righteousness. Job's character being directly vindicated, his disinterestedness established, there was no reason why the story should end with the sufferings inflicted for a particular purpose made perpetual after the purpose had been achieved.

The removal of the speech of Yahweh, if the Epilogue remained, would leave the vindication of Job and the consequent condemnation of the theory of the friends unobscured, not to say clearer than it is; and since the speech contains no positive theory of suffering, no counter theory to that of the friends, it has to some appeared alien to the original work. Yet the omission of the speech would leave Job without that direct manifestation and speech to him of God which he had desired, and unanswered except by the restoration of his fortunes, which he had not desired; God would still speak at the end of the debate, but—in condemnation, it is true—to Eliphaz only! Towards Job he would then remain silent to the end. If, then, the speech can be related in some such way as has been attempted above to the rest of the book, it is certainly safest to retain it; for (§ 30) there are no independent reasons of style, etc., for regarding the chapters as secondary. Had an inter-

polator felt called upon to compose a speech, it is only too probable that he would, like the author of Elihu, have dwelt more clearly and directly upon Job's blameworthiness. On the other hand, it is difficult to see what kind of speech, creating fewer difficulties or giving greater satisfaction, could have been composed by a writer who like the original author (1) intended to insist that Job had not suffered for sins he had committed, and that the theory which necessitated the inference that he had, was therefore false; and (2) had yet no positive theory of suffering to propound, and was rather, perhaps, inclined to deprecate the formation of fresh theories, lest, resting as they must upon inadequate knowledge, they too should have practical results as terrible as his own experience had shown flowed from the current theory. For these reasons, while still sensible of certain difficulties and the necessity for some subtlety in defending the speech as an integral part of the book, I now retain it more decisively than in my *Crit. Introd. to the OT.*, pp. 119–122.

§ 41. Any judgement of the scope and purpose of the book is much more affected by the question of the integrity of the speech(es) of Elihu. Reasons which have appeared and are likely to appear to many sufficient to show that this part of the book is an addition to the original poem, and consequently must not be used in determining the purpose of the author of the original work, have already been given (§ 22 ff.); and these reasons are enforced rather than weakened by the attempts that have been made to find here the original author's solution of the problem of the book.

The ablest and most elaborate of these attempts is Bu.'s, which is thus described and criticized by Dr. *LOT*^{9} 430 f.:—"A different view of the scope of the book is taken by those who—as Schlottmann, Hengst., Riehm (*Einl.* ii. 263 f., 278 f.), and especially Budde—acknowledge the Elihu-speeches as an original part of the poem. These writers consider that what was indicated above as a collateral aim of the book, viz., the doctrine of the *disciplinary* or *purifying* value of suffering, is in reality its main aim — or, at least (Riehm), its main positive aim. Thus Budde (*Comm.* p. xxx (^{2} xl) ff. etc.) observes that Job, though righteous before the visit of his friends, in defending his righteousness against their silent reproaches (2^{13}) and (c. 4–5, etc.) open attacks, fell into sin: *spiritual pride*, a sin subtler even than the selfishness of his piety, which was what the

tempter suspected, was latent in his nature from the first (cp. Riehm, p. 263): and the object of the suffering sent upon him was to bring this hid'en sin to his consciousness, to lead him to confess it, as he does in 42^{2-5}, and so to purify and confirm his spiritual nature. . . . The original folk-tale [§ 7] of Job, in which the question was, *Is Egoism the root of piety? Is there such a thing as disinterested piety?* . . . the poet adopted as the framework for his thoughts. With him, however, the question becomes a deeper and broader one, *Can the righteous suffer? and if so, why?* and the trial of Job's righteousness (which is the theme of the Prologue) becomes the purification of his character and the confirmation of his faith. . . . Consistently with this view of the general scope of the book, the same writers consider not only that the Elihu-speeches are the work of the original author, but that they present his own solution of the problem. And so Budde remarks ([2] pp. xlv ff., 223) that Eliphaz (c. 4–5) explains suffering only as a punishment of *actual* sin: Job takes the same view of it; Elihu, on the contrary, explains it as designed to make man conscious of *latent* sin, and thereby to enable him to repent and overcome it. Budde defends his theory of the book with marked skill and ability; but it may be doubted whether a doctrine which, however true and profound in the abstract, is so little developed by the poet himself, can have formed the main idea of his work. The doctrine of the disciplinary function of suffering is very subordinate in the book; even in Elihu it does not stand out with the clearness and directness that would be expected, if the poet were there presenting his own solution of the problem. Nor, though it is true that Elihu sees in suffering a purpose of grace, is it at all clear that he views it as sent only (or even chiefly) for the correction of *latent* sin: and pride is alluded to by him only in 33^{17} 36^{9}." It may be added that the text and meaning of 33^{17} is not quite certain (see n. there), and that the term in 36^{9} (יתגברו) implies anything but subtle spiritual pride: it refers, as the context also shows (vv.$^{10-12}$), to proud, defiant, opposition to God's will and refusal to serve Him—the very opposite of Job's blameless and God-fearing life. There would, too, be something humorous in Elihu, who certainly suffers from no excess of humility, rebuking Job for spiritual pride. See, further, on 33^{8-13} (p. 285) 34^{7}.

Of the very extensive literature, in addition to commentaries, introductions to the OT., and articles in Bible Dictionaries on the purpose of the book, the following may be mentioned: Bernstein (as cited in § 28 n.); Seinecke, *Der Grundgedanke des B. Ijob* (1863); Godet, *Études Bibliques* (1873), E. T. (1875); Froude, *Short Studies on Great Subjects* (1867), i. 266 f.; Wellhausen, in *JDT*, 1871, 552–557; W. H. Green, *The Argument of the Book of Job unfolded* (1873); J. B. Mozley, *Essays Historical and Theological*, 1878, ii. 164–254; Giesebrecht, *Der Wendepunkt des B. H.* (1879); C. H. H. Wright, *Biblical Essays* (1886), 1–33; A. M. Fairbairn, *The City of God* (1886), 143 ff.; G. G. Bradley, *Lectures on the Book of Job* (1888); Meinhold, "Das Problems des B. H.," in *Neue Jahrbb. f. deutsche Theol.* (1892), 63 ff.; J. Ley, "Das Problem in B. H. u. dessen Lösung," in *Neue Jahrbb. f. Phil. u. Pädag.* (1896), 125 ff.; E. Meyer, *Gesch. d. Altertums* (1901), iii. 228–231; A. S. Peake, *The Problem of Suffering in the OT.* (1904), especially c. v.; H. W. Robinson, *The Cross of Job* (1916).

VI. The Age of the Book.

§ 42. As to the age of Job, opinions have differed perhaps more widely than with regard to any other book of the OT., though in recent times there is increasing agreement that while the book is certainly older than the 1st, it is scarcely older than the 5th or at all events the 6th cent. B.C.

It is often said that the book was traditionally ascribed to Moses; this is not correct, if by it is meant that such was the consistent ancient opinion. On the other hand, early Jewish was scarcely less divided than modern opinion. In the well-known passage in the Babylonian Talmud (*Baba Bathra*, 14b, 15a) on the origin of the books of the OT. it is stated that "Moses wrote his own book, and the passages about Balaam and Job"; but in the discussion that follows various Rabbis ascribe the book (or the lifetime) of Job to the age of Isaac, or Jacob, or Joseph, or the spies, or the Judges, or of the kingdom of Sheba, or of the return from the Captivity, or of Ahasuerus.

The passage is translated in full in Ryle, *Canon of the OT.* 273 ff. The various opinions rest on a very crude form of criticism; *e.g.* the similarity of עוץ Job 1^{1} and עץ Nu. 13^{20}; the use of אפוא in Job 19^{23} and Ex. 33^{16}; the supposition that Job was married to Dinah, Jacob's daughter, since in connection with both Dinah and Job's wife the term נבלה is used or implied (Job 2^{10}, Gn. 34^{7}).

§ 43. External evidence clearly defines *c.* 100 B.C. as the downward limit of date; and by then the book already contained the speech(es) of Elihu, and had been translated into Greek.

The evidence consists of a passage extracted by Eus. (*Præp. Ev.* ix. 25) from Alexander Polyhistor (80–40 B.C.), who in turn cites from Aristeas; Aristeas having summarized the story in the Prologue runs much more summarily over the rest of the story; in Polyhistor's words: Ἀριστέας δέ φησιν ἐν τῷ περὶ Ἰουδαίων . . . φαύλως δὲ αὐτοῦ (*sc.* Ἰωβ) διακειμένου ἐλθεῖν εἰς ἐπίσκεψιν Ἐλιφαν τὸν Θαιμανιτῶν βασιλέα καὶ Βαλδαδ τῶν Σαυχαίων τύραννον καὶ Σωφαρ τὸν Μανναίων βασιλέα, ἐλθεῖν δὲ καὶ Ἐλιουν τὸν Βαραχιηλ τὸν Ζωβίτην. Παρακαλουμένον δὲ, φάναι καὶ χωρὶς παρακλήσεως ἐμμενεῖν αὐτὸν ἔν τε τῇ εὐσεβείᾳ καὶ τοῖς δεινοῖς. Τὸν δὲ θεὸν, ἀγασθεντα τὴν εὐψυχίαν αὐτοῦ, τῆς τε νόσου αὐτὸν ἀπυλῦσαι, καὶ πολλῶν κύριον ὑπάρξεων ποιῆσαι.

Ben-Sirach[1] (*c.* 180 B.C.) refers to Job as a person mentioned in the book of Ezekiel; but this would suggest unfamiliarity rather than familiarity with the *Book* of Job, and yet the parallel passages (§ 45) prove that (unless Job was written later than Sir.) Sir. was actually familiar with the book of Job.

§ 44. We are thus thrown back on internal evidence for such determination of the upward and of such exacter determination of downward limits of date as may be possible.

(1) Since the author's imagination extends to the setting of the poem, it is a mistake to infer the age of the *writer* from the circumstances of the *hero* of the book. Broadly speaking, the age in which the writer intends us to think of Job as living, but certainly not that to which he himself belonged, is the patriarchal age, and he depicts conditions which he regarded as characteristic of that age. This is very clearly seen in the length of life assigned to Job: he lived 140 years after the restoration of his fortunes, and therefore something approaching, if not exceeding 200 in all (perhaps 210 years, 42^{16} n.); in other words, his years exceeded those of Abraham (175, Gn. 25^{7}), Isaac (180, Gn. 35^{28}), and Jacob (147, Gn. 47^{28}), though they fell much short of those of the antediluvians. As part of this imaginative setting, not necessarily as reproducing the conditions actually prevailing in or peculiar to the author's own age, or applying to the writer's own circumstances, we may regard the description of Job's wealth in cattle and slaves (1^{1}, cp. Gn. 13; 26^{12-14} 33), his sacrificing as head of a family, like Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, without the assistance of a priest, his use of burnt-offerings rather than the more specific expiatory sacrifices of the later codes (1^{5} n.), the currency of the *ḳ^e^sîṭah* (42^{11}, Gn. 33^{19}, Jos. $24^{32\dagger}$). It is only when familiarity with conditions and customs not belonging to the patriarchal age, or at all events less characteristic of it than of later ages, is shown, that we may look for light on the writer's own age: thus in contrast to the Hebrew patriarchs, Job is apparently himself a monogamist ($2^{9f.}$ 19^{17} 31^{10}) and a

[1] 49^{10} יחזקאל . . . הזכיר את איוב המכלכל כל דרכי צדק. In 𝔊 which mistranslates, and EV. which depends on 𝔊, the reference disappears.

member of a society in which monogamy prevails (27^{15} not being proof to the contrary)—a feature most characteristic of an age later than Dt. (21^{15-17}) and reflected also in other Wisdom literature (cp. *EBi.* 2947); the part played by Sheba —the Sabæans—in 1^{15} n. 6^{19} can be illustrated by an inscription dating probably from about 525 B.C.; and the political vicissitudes reflected in 9^{24} $12^{17ff.}$, the unhappy social conditions suggested by 3^{20} 7^{1} 24^{12}, the developed judicial system implied in the phraseology of 9^{14-19} (cp. Index, *s.v.* Law), are scarcely those of the patriarchal but of some later age, though whether that be the age of Sennacherib, Nebuchadnezzar, Alexander the Great, or some other, the allusions are far too general to determine. See, further, 15^{19} n.

This line of evidence does not by itself lead to any very precise or secure result, though some of it suggests a date not earlier than the Exile.

§ 45. (2) The book is certainly not a product of the earliest periods of Hebrew literature. It is certainly later than Ps. 8, for in 7^{17} the writer parodies Ps. $8^{5\,(4)}$; if, as is probable, Ps. 8 implies familiarity with P, and P was written about 500 B.C., this alone brings down the book of Job as late as the 5th cent. B.C. It is scarcely less certain that in 3^{3-10} the author of Job is dependent on Jer. 20^{14-18}, though Di. (p. xxxii f.) still strongly argued for the dependence of Jer. 20^{14-18} on Job 3^{3-10}.

There are many other passages in Job which have points of resemblance with passages in other books, and some of such a character as to indicate direct literary dependence on one side or other; but (1) it is generally difficult to determine on which side dependence lies; (2) some of the passages in question are of uncertain date. If the dependence lies mainly or exclusively on the side of Job, it shows very great familiarity of the author with the literature of his people, and also his great literary craftmanship, for the phrases or figures borrowed are used by him freshly and independently; if the dependence is on the side of the other writings, the parallels show the extent of the influence of the book of Job on subsequent writers. Probably by far the greater number of cases of real literary dependence is on the part of the author of Job. Of the vast number of "parallels" that have been collected, a selection may be given, though in by no means all even of these is direct literary connection necessarily implied.

With	14^{11} $12^{24ff.}$	cp.	Is. $19^{5.13ff.}$
,,	4^{8}	,,	Hos. 10^{13}, Pr. 22^{8}
,,	5^{18}	,,	,, 6^{1}, Dt. 32^{39}
,,	14^{17}	,,	,, 13^{12} ,, 32^{34}
,,	$9^{8.9}$ 12^{15}	,,	Am. 4^{13} 5^{8} 9^{6}
,,	18^{16}	,,	,, 2^{9}
,,	42^{2}	,,	Gn. 11^{6} (J)
,,	$6^{15ff.}$	,,	Jer. 15^{18}
,,	9^{19}	,,	,, 49^{19}
,,	12^{4}	,,	,, 20^{7b}, La. 3^{14}
,,	12^{6} 21^{7} 13^{3}	,,	,, 12^{1}
,,	19^{24}	,,	,, 17^{1}
,,	19^{7}	,,	,, 20^{8}, La. 3^{8}
,,	3^{23} 19^{8}	,,	Is. 40^{27}, La. 3^{7-9}
,,	9^{8}	,,	,, 44^{24}
,,	13^{19}	,,	,, 50^{8}
,,	13^{28}	,,	,, 50^{9}
,,	14^{2}	,,	,, $40^{6f.}$, Ps. 90^{6} $103^{15f.}$
,,	15^{35}	,,	,, 59^{4}, Ps. 7^{15}
,,	16^{19} 30^{19}	,,	,, 50^{8}
,,	16^{17}	,,	,, 53^{9}
,,	$26^{12f.}$	,,	,, $51^{9f.}$
,,	42^{17}	,,	Gn. 35^{29} (P) 25^{8} (P)

With	31^{15}	cp.	Mal. 2^{10}
,,	7^{20} 16^{12}	,,	La. 3^{12}
,,	9^{18}	,,	,, 3^{15}
,,	$16^{9f.}$	,,	,, 2^{16} 3^{46}
,,	30^{9}	,,	,, $3^{14.63}$
,,	$5^{17f.}$	,,	Pr. $3^{11f.}$
,,	5^{19-24}	,,	,, 3^{23-26}
,,	12^{13}	,,	,, 8^{14}
,,	15^{7}	,,	,, 8^{25}
,,	18^{7}	,,	,, 4^{12}
,,	26^{10}	,,	,, 8^{27}
,,	28^{15-19}	,,	,, $3^{14f.}$ $8^{11.19}$
,,	$18^{5f.}$ 21^{17}	,,	,, 13^{9} 24^{20}
,,	26^{6}	,,	,, 15^{11}
,,	12^{21}	,,	Ps. 107^{40}
,,	21^{11}	,,	,, 107^{41} $114^{4.6}$
,,	22^{19}	,,	,, 107^{42}
,,	$6^{10.25}$	,,	,, $119^{50.103}$
,,	7^{19} $10^{20f.}$	,,	,, 39^{14}
,,	29^{14}	,,	,, 72^{12}
,,	1^{21}	,,	Qoh. 5^{14}
,,	4^{7}	,,	Sir. 2^{10}
,,	28^{27}	,,	,, 1^{9}
,,	31^{18}	,,	,, 4^{10}

For further discussion of these and other parallels and conclusions (often in different directions), see J. Barth, *Beiträge zur Erklärung des Buches Hiob*, 1–17; Di. xxx.–xxxiv.; Seyring, *Die Abhangigkeit der Sprüche Salomos cc. 1–9 von Hiob* (1889); H. L. Strack, "Die Priorität d. B. H. gegenüber den Einleitungsreden z. d. Sprüchen Salomonis," in *TSK*, 1896, 609 ff.; Che. *Job and Sol.* 83–89; *The Prophecies of Isaiah*^{3}, i. 228 (on parallels with the Song of Hezekiah), ii. 245 f.; Dr. *LOT*^{6} 434 f.

§ 46. (3) The theology and religious ideas of the book of Job are those of a relatively late period, though not of quite the latest period represented in the OT. The book presupposes (*a*) a general agreement as to the religious value of the individual independently of the community, of personality: yet also (*b*) a practically unchallenged conviction that the real life or personality of the individual is terminated by death; (*a*) is the necessary condition of the entire discussion, and (*b*) determines its limitation: had there been a general belief in the survival

after death of the personality with undiminished or enhanced relations with God, this must have affected the discussion by Job and the friends of the sufferings of the righteous and the prosperity of the wicked in this life. Now of these two ideas (*a*) is seen emerging against the still prevalent acceptance of the principle of solidarity at the end of the 7th cent. B.C. (Dt. 24^{16}, Ezk. 18. 33, Jer. $31^{29f.}$), and (*b*) was already discarded by at least the important circles represented by the book of Daniel (12^{2}: cp. also the post-exilic prophecy, Is. 24–27; and see *Isaiah*, p. 399 f.), *i.e.* by about 167 B.C.[1] Consequently the book of Job is best explained as the product of a period lying between the close of the 7th and the beginning of the 2nd cent. B.C., and indeed at some distance from either of these extreme limits; considerably earlier than the 2nd cent., for even the Elihu speeches, separated probably, as the linguistic differences suggest, by a century or two from the rest of the book, say nothing of an after life; and considerably later than the 7th cent., for what there appears as a freshly gained perception is here the common possession of Job and his opponents in debate who represent the current theology of the time. Certainly the question of the sufferings of the righteous was much discussed from the close of the 7th cent. onwards, but the question is at first raised either with reference to *nations* (Hab. $1^{13f.}$, Is. 40–55), or if in reference to individuals (Jer. 12^{1-3}) yet in such a way as not to suggest that it was one of general concern. Such Pss. as 37. 49 and 73, which discuss the question, are themselves of uncertain date though scarcely pre-exilic. But Mal. 2^{17} $3^{14.15}$, certainly written in the middle of the 5th cent. B.C., offer significant parallels to the formulation of the problem in Job.

Other ideas agree well with such a date as the 5th cent. or independently suggest it. A lofty monotheism (cp. 1^{6} n. 31^{26-28} n.), such as Deut.-Isaiah had *argued for*, is *presupposed* in all parts of the book; and the descriptions in Job of God's majesty and might in nature and history are not as the similar

[1] The doctrine of a future life also appears in 𝔊—not only in the Appendix to the book, most of which at least is later than the original version but also in 14^{14}: see *Exp.*, 1920 (June), 430.

description in Deut.-Is. introduced to prove that there is no room for any other but one God, but that that one God's ways are past man's comprehension. Under God are angels (5^1 15^{15} 38^7) with well-defined functions (ct. 1 K. 22), such as that of interceding for men (5^1 n. 33^{23} n.) or criticizing them—the Satan. The Satan of Job appears to belong to an earlier period than Satan (without the art) of 1 Ch. 21^1 (not earlier than *c.* 300 B.C.), and is decisively earlier than ὁ διάβολος of Wis. 2^{24}, but is later rather than as early as or earlier than the Satan of Zec. 3 (520 B.C.): see 1^6 n. The highly developed ethical standpoint, implicit particularly in c. 31, also points to a relatively late period.

§ 47. (4) Like the ideas, the language of the book is late, though not so late as that of some other books of the OT. (*e.g.* Eccl. Ch.). Certain linguistic features taken by themselves would point even to a period earlier rather than later than the 5th cent. B.C.: thus אנכי (§ 25) is relatively more frequent in Job than in Is. 40–55 (Job—excluding Elihu—אנכי 12, אני 20; Is. 40–55, אנכי 18, אני 54). Many other features point away from the latest periods—*e.g.* the use of the waw conversive (ct. Eccl.), the avoidance of ש (ct. *e.g.* Eccl.). On the other hand, there are distinct signs of lateness. Even apart from the Elihu speeches, the Aramaisms (§ 28)—decidedly more conspicuous than in Is. 40–55—are very noticeable; and so also is the use of ל as the *nota acc.*: see 5^2 n. 8^8 n. 9^{11} n. 12^{23} 14^{21} 19^{28} 21^{22} 23^8—and perhaps 34^8 (Elihu). The rarer forms of particles and pronominal suffixes (§ 26), which form a striking feature of the language of Job, might be largely explained as the idiosyncrasy of a writer of any period, but as a whole (cp. *Isaiah*, p. 467) point rather to a relatively late period. The vocabulary contains very much that is peculiar (see Index II.) to the book, including a number of words explicable only from the Arabic,[1] and sometimes termed, with questionable propriety, Arabisms; but this does not, at all events directly, contribute anything to the determination of the date.

Thus the various lines of evidence converge towards the conclusion that Job was most probably written in the 5th cent.

[1] See references under "Arabic" in Index I.

B.C.; since much of the evidence taken in isolation is neither rigorous nor indicative of such narrow limits as a century, the possibility of a somewhat earlier or a somewhat later date may be entertained as alternatives; but several lines of evidence are very unfavourable to any theory of much earlier or much later date.

VII. The Text.

§ 48. As in other books of the OT., so in Job variants that materially affect the sense, whether between existing MSS of 𝔐 or between the Qrê and K^{e}thib, are not numerous; but 𝔊 here, as elsewhere, points to the existence of now lost MSS that differed more extensively. Unfortunately the determination of the Hebrew text lying behind 𝔊 is rendered peculiarly difficult in Job by the fact that the version is often free and paraphrastic;[1] and the use of 𝔊 for determining the original text of 𝔐 is greatly limited by the fact that much of that text was not rendered at all.

Printed editions of 𝔊 (including Swete's), following the great mass of Greek MSS, it is true, present a text not differing greatly in extent from 𝔐; but this text, as we know from the most direct and certain evidence,[2] has resulted from the addition to the short ancient version of Job, dating from before, but not necessarily long before, 80 B.C.,[3] of renderings of many passages not contained in that version from later Greek versions, chiefly *Θ*, very much more rarely *'A*, *Σ* (2nd cent. A.D.). These additions to the original text of 𝔊 were made by Origen in the Hexapla, but were there distinguished by the use of diacritical marks; subsequently the Hexaplaric text drove out the much shorter text, and, further, the diacritical marks were

[1] Many illustrations of this will be found in the phil. nn. (*e.g.* on 8^{19} 9^{13} 14^{14} 15^{28} $17^{1.2}$ 20^{15} 29^{18} $30^{13.14}$ 32^{14} 36^{19}). See also Bi. *De Indole vers. Alex. Jobi*, 1862.

[2] Origen, *Ad African*. 4. Cp. Jer. *Præf. in Hiob.*

[3] Aristeas (*c.* 80 B.C.) made use of the version (cp. § 43). On this and the date of 𝔊, see Swete, *OT. in Greek*, 25, 370 f.; Schürer, *Gesch. d. jüd. Volkes*[3], 311, 356 f.; J. Freudenthal, *Hellenistische Studien*, 136 ff. Grätz in the *Monatsschrift*, 1877, p. 83 ff. (cp. *Exp.*, June 1920, p. 430) argued unconvincingly that 𝔊 was no older than the middle of the first cent. A.D.

commonly omitted, surviving only in two Greek minuscules,[1] in two Latin MSS,[2] and in the unique MS of $𝔖^H$.[3] These five MSS[4] differ in some places as to the positions of the marks, and so leave a certain amount of doubt as to the exact extent of the additions made by Origen.

A witness of another kind to the original extent of 𝔊 appeared with the discovery of 𝔎—the Sahidic version of 𝔊.[5] Ciasca, who edited this, argued that 𝔎 was a pre-Hexaplaric version of 𝔊, and his view was commonly accepted. Burkitt, on the other hand (*EBi.* 5027 f.), argues that 𝔎 is "a translation of Origen's revised text *with the passages under asterisk omitted*"; in this case 𝔎 is still a valuable witness, though its evidence is now in reality early evidence as to the use of the Hexaplaric marks. Be the exact relation of 𝔎 to the Hexaplaric text what it may, from it the passages asterisked in the MSS of 𝔊, 𝔏, and $𝔖^H$ are, broadly speaking,[6] absent, and

[1] HP 248 (= Cod. Vaticanus, 346, c. xiv. sæc.) and the Cod. Colbertinus (Paris, nr. 1952).

[2] An Oxford MS (Bodleian 2426) and a Tours MS (Turonensis 18): ed. P. de Lagarde in *Mittheilungen*, ii. 193–237: cp. G. Beer in *ZATW*, 1896, 297–314; 1897, 97–122; 1898, 257–286.

[3] Published in facsimile by A. M. Ceriani, *Codex Syro-hexaplaris Ambrosianus*, Milan, 1874.

[4] The evidence of these together with the fragments of ΘΣ 'Α were collected by Field in *Origenis Hexaplorum quæ supersunt* (1875)—published before the discovery of 𝔎. For corrections of and additions to Field, see J. B. Pitra, *Analecta Sacra* (1883), 556 f.; E. Klostermann, *Analecta zur Septuaginta* (1895), 68–74. See also E. Tisserant in *RB*, 1912, 481–503; 1919, 89–105, 500–505, and A. Rahlfs, *Mit. d. Septuaginta-Unternehmen*, i. 7 (1915)—all on the Greek Uncial Cod. Hierosolymitanus Sanctæ Crucis, no. 36.

[5] Edited by Ciasca in *Sacrorum Bibl. fragmenta Copto-Sahidica*, Romæ, 1889, ii. 1–68. From mutilation of MSS, cc. 39^9–40^8 of this version are missing. The lower Egyptian, or Bohairic, version of 𝔊 was edited and translated by H. Tattam (*The ancient Coptic Version of the book of Job*, London, 1846); but this version contains the Hexaplaric additions and is of relatively little interest. An index of existing Coptic texts of Job is given by A. Vaschalde in *RB*, 1920, 95–98.

[6] Thus the only stichoi asterisked in $𝔖^H$ and yet present in 𝔎 are 9^{15b} (in 𝔎 before 9^{15a}) 17^{16b} $20^{3.4a}$ 25^{6b} 27^1 30^{22b}; and of these 25^{6b} and 27^1 (in 𝔊 exactly $= 29^1$, which is not asterisked even in $𝔖^H$) are not asterisked in any other MSS. On the possibility of some of the remaining four passages being pre-Origenian, see p. lxxiii, n. 3.

so far as extent is concerned 𝔖 closely represents the pre-Origenian and presumably also the original state of 𝔊. It is probable, indeed, that to a very small extent the present defect of 𝔖 is due to loss in the transmission of 𝔖 itself.[1] On the other hand, there is some reason for thinking that two passages corresponding to nothing in 𝔐 but found in 𝔖 as in all other authorities for 𝔊 after 2^{9} 42^{17}, formed no part of the original text of 𝔊;[2] and it is also possible that a very small number of entire stichoi common to 𝔊, 𝔖, and 𝔐, are derived from or influenced by the later Greek Versions.[3]

§ 49. Of the existing text of 𝔐, then, there appears to have been in the original text of 𝔊 no equivalent for (1) the passages absent from 𝔖 (except 1^{15b} 6^{15a} 15^{19a} $33^{15b.\,16a}$ 37^{21b}); (2) some dozen stichoi in 39^{9}–40^{8a} (lost through mutilation of the MS in

[1] Due to loss, probably in the transmission of 𝔖 (and if not, then in the earlier transmission of the text of 𝔊 rendered by 𝔖) are probably the few lines absent from 𝔖 though not asterisked in *any* of the existing MSS containing the Hexaplaric marks: there are 1^{15b} 6^{15a} and 15^{19a} $33^{15b.\,16a}$ 37^{21b}. In the case of $33^{15b.\,16a}$, homoioteleuton, as Ciasca pointed out, would easily account for the loss of the lines in Sahidic, while the rendering of רוח by *νοῦς* instead of *πνεῦμα* points strongly to 𝔊 rather than Θ or any of the other later versions.

[2] See *The Additions in the Ancient Greek Version of Job* (*Exp.*, June 1920, 422–438). The conclusions there reached were that the speech of Job's wife in 2^{9} as well as the Appendix (after 42^{17}) formed no part of the original version: the vocabulary in 2^{9} points strongly to a different hand: note *λάτρις, μόχθος, αἴθριος, διανυκτερεύειν, πλανῆτις, εἰς τὸ κενόν*. The minor additions of a word or a clause such as occur in $1^{1.\,3.\,5.\,21.\,22}$ 2^{10} $5^{4.\,27}$ $7^{16.\,19}$ 13^{25} 15^{28} 24^{4} 31^{9} 33^{23} 38^{1} 41^{5} $42^{5.\,10.\,11.\,16}$ may most or all of them be original to the version.

[3] From what has been said above (p. lxxii, n. 6), it is clear that the stichoi present in 𝔖, which all the MSS with the Hexaplaric marks *agree* in marking as additions, do not exceed half a dozen. In one or two of these cases, style supports the suggestion of the Hexaplaric marks that the stichoi, though in 𝔖, were derived from, or at least as now read influenced by, Θ. Thus in 17^{16} *χῶμα* (= עפר) points to Θ, who substitutes it for 𝔊's *πέτρα* in 14^{8}, for 𝔊's *γῇ* in 19^{25}; note also in 20^{3} *παιδεία* (cp. Θ 36^{10} 37^{8}; and ct. *νουθέτημα* in 5^{17} 𝔊). It is possible 𝔖 in these cases rests on a text of 𝔊 not yet affected by Θ: thus in 17^{16} ⲉⲡⲕⲁϩ *might* render *γῆς* (which, if the stichos actually stood in 𝔊, would almost certainly have been used) just as well as the *χώματος* of the existing text. So in 20^{3} *παιδεία* and perhaps also *ἀποκριθήσεταί μοι* rather point to Θ; but 𝔖 might be a rendering not of these words, but of *νουθέτημα* (cp. 5^{17}) and *δώσει μοι ἀπόκρισιν* (cp. 13^{22} 𝔊 and 𝔖), which would probably have been used by 𝔊.

𝔏), viz. $39^{13-18.\ 28.}$ (ἐπ' ἐξοχῇ πέτρας καὶ ἀποκρύφῳ) $^{29b.\ 30}$ asterisked in $𝔖^{H}$, and in some or all of the other MSS giving the Hexaplaric marks; (3) certain stichoi, present in 𝔏 but asterisked in $𝔖^{H}$ and (or) other MSS, such as 17^{16} 20^{3}. The number of stichoi involved in (1) and (2) is between 350 and 400; to these (3) adds at most a relatively negligible quantity.[1] A list of the omissions of 𝔊 is given in § 31.

§ 50. Does, now, this defect of 𝔊 represent an earlier or later form of the text than 𝔐?[2] Is it due—in the main at least—to the loss or disregard on the part of the translation of what previously existed? or is it due to the subsequent expansion of the Hebrew text by the addition of the matter now found in 𝔐, but absent from the earlier form of 𝔊? In considering this question these observations may be made:

(1) The main structure of the book is unaffected by the defect of 𝔊: in 𝔊 as in 𝔐 there are found Prologue, Dialogue, with three cycles—two complete and one incomplete—of speeches, the speeches of Elihu, the speeches of Yahweh (including the lengthy descriptions of Behemoth and Leviathan), and the Epilogue.

(2) The defect is not at all evenly distributed over the book. The following table may serve to indicate this sufficiently:

[1] A defect of 350 stichoi represents about ⅙ of the whole, the total length of the existing text of 𝔐 being equivalent to about 2200 stichoi, and the stichoi of the conflate Greek text ranging in different MSS from 2021^{A} $2126^{ℵ}$ to 2153^{B}. Some of the stichometries indicate a larger proportion of originally absent stichoi, giving the number of non-asterisked stichoi, *i.e.* the stichoi of the original version, as 1800, 1700, 1600, the last figure having the better authority (cp. Swete, *Introduction*, 347, 350; *PRE* viii. 101 with references). Klostermann (*ib.* 102) concludes that 𝔊 was originally shorter by at least a quarter than the existing text of 𝔐.

[2] The priority of 𝔐 was generally unchallenged till 1889, when E. Hatch, in *Essays on Biblical Greek* (vi.), argued for the priority of 𝔊—that, in the main 𝔊 represented the original extent of the book and 𝔐 an amplification. In favour of the priority of 𝔊 is also Bi. (2); cp. the English translation of Job by E. J. Dillon in *The Sceptics of the OT.*, 1895. This theory has been criticized and the priority of 𝔊 maintained especially by Di. (*Sitzungsberichte d. Berliner Ak.*, 1890, pp. 1345-1373), Dr. (*Contemporary Review*, Feb. 1896, p. 159 ff.), Bu.

	STICHOI ABSENT FROM 𝔊.	APPROXIMATE PERCENTAGE OF THE WHOLE NUMBER OF STICHOI IN 𝔐.
Prologue	1	
First Cycle of Speeches—		
Cc. 3–6	0	
,, 7–11	6	
,, 12–14	17–23	4
Second Cycle 15–21 . .	59	16
Third ,, 22–31 . .	124	25
Elihu 32–37 . .	114	35
Yahweh 38–42^{6} . .	43	16
Epilogue	3	

(3) The passages absent from 𝔊 are not in Hebrew distinguished from the rest by any differences of style and vocabulary, but on the other hand they are connected with them by some noticeable similarities. Thus what is absent from 𝔊 employs the same three terms for God—אל (7 times), אלוה (3 times), שדי (2 times); and as within 𝔐 there is a difference in the degree of preference for אל (see above, § 24), so also is there in the passages of Elihu absent from 𝔊 (אל six times, אלוה once). Similarly the passages absent from 𝔊 contain in 𝔐 several of the rarer particles (see above, § 26), as, *e.g.*, אלי in 29^{19} and עלימו (27^{23} 30^{27}).

(4) The removal of the passages absent from 𝔊 in many cases destroys the poetical structure by depriving one parallel line of its fellow, *e.g.* 10^{4a} 20^{14b} 31^{27a} 33^{8a} $34^{6b.\,11b.\,18b}$ 39^{6b}, while in few if any cases does 𝔊 yield good distichs where 𝔐 has tristichs or isolated stichoi. It is true Bi. establishes at least an appearance of a very rigid poetical structure, but this he does not by accurately reproducing 𝔊, but by omitting both more and less: *e.g.* in 10^{4} he omits 10^{4a} with 𝔊, but then also 10^{5a} without the authority of 𝔊, in order to obtain a distich of sorts indeed, but inferior to either of the distichs in 𝔐.

Of the foregoing (1) is obviously quite indecisive: a book of the present length of 𝔐 may have been abbreviated; on the other hand, a shorter book which had already been expanded

by the addition of the speeches of Elihu might at a later date have been expanded in quite a different way by the addition of what is present in 𝔐, but was absent from 𝔊. But (2) already inclines the balance against the priority of 𝔊: it would have been natural for an abbreviator to shorten increasingly in the successive cycles, which in general cover much the same ground, and most of all in the speeches of Elihu, which contribute so little that is fresh. On the other hand, increasing activity on the part of an expander such as would be required to account for the distribution of the additional matter is less likely. Finally, (3) and (4) tell heavily against the priority of 𝔊 and in favour of 𝔐.

But although in the main 𝔐, so far as extent is concerned, represents an earlier text than 𝔊, some of the omissions of 𝔊 are of passages which there are independent reasons for suspecting not to belong to the original text of 𝔐: see, *e.g.*, 7^8 12^9 23^9 with the notes. Yet it must remain uncertain whether even these passages which relatively to the whole omissions of 𝔊 are exceedingly few, are absent because not in 𝔊's Hebrew text, or like the rest of the omissions are due to abbreviation—in these cases accidentally restoring the original text.

§ 51. In those parts of the book rendered by the early version, 𝔊 sometimes points to a better text than 𝔐, though less frequently, and on account of its paraphrastic tendency less clearly, than in some other books (*e.g.* Samuel). The other ancient versions[1] made direct from the Hebrew rarely serve, where 𝔊 fails, to correct 𝔐. Many places remain in which neither 𝔐 nor any text to which the versions point can be regarded as original: in these cases the original must be regained, if at all, by conjecture, and here rhythm becomes a valuable aid.

[1] On these see for 𝔖, A. Mandl, *Die Peschittha z. Hiob*, Leipzig, 1892; E. Stenij, *De Syriaca libri Jobi interpretatione quæ Peschîta vocatur*, Helsingfors, 1887; E. Baumann, "Die Verwendbarkeit der Pešita z. B. Hiob für die Textkritik," in *ZATW*, 1898–1900: for 𝔗, W. Bacher, "Das Targum z. Hiob," in *Monatsschrift*, 1871, 208–223, 283 f.; M. Lewin, *Targum u. Midrasch zum Buche Hiob*, 1895.

VIII. The Rhythms[1] of the Book of Job.

§ 52. The prevailing rhythmical form in the book is that of the balanced distich of two lines each containing three stresses (3 : 3); but this is only the prevailing, not the exclusive rhythm; still less do the lines necessarily consist exclusively of seven syllables (Bi.), or the distichs regularly coalesce into quatrains (Bi. Du.).

The dominance of the 3 : 3 rhythm is too obvious to call for proof here, but on the extent of departure from it—certainly in the existing and probably also in the original text—something more must be said. It follows from their rigid quatrain theory that Bi. and Du. allow no tristichs in the original text, though in what they regard as additions to the original they sometimes imagine more tristichs than exist now, or ever existed (see p. 205). In the existing text there are in all a considerable number of tristichs, or, alternatively, distichs preceded or followed by isolated stichoi;[2] some of these are open to more or less suspicion,[3] but a number remain which there is no reason whatever, beyond the fact that they are tristichs, for questioning. Although elsewhere combined with 3 : 3 there occur as occasional variants other divisions of the full six-stress period, viz. 2 : 2 : 2 or 2 : 4 or 4 : 2; in the book of Job these variants are at most exceedingly rare: see phil. n. on $17^{1.11}$, also *AJSL* xxxvi. 95 ff. A striking example of 2 : 2 : 2 would be 9^{21}, if the text is correct there.

On the other hand, of other rhythms there are examples, relatively rare, it is true, yet actually too numerous in the present text for it to be probable that none are original. Thus in the phil. n. on 17^{14} (p. *114*) references are given to 22

[1] Cp. G. B. Gray, *The Forms of Hebrew Poetry*; and more briefly, *Isaiah*, pp. lix–lxviii, on the subject of Hebrew rhythm generally. For rhythm in Job in particular, see Bi.; J. Ley, *TSK*, 1895, 635 ff., 1897, p. 7 ff.; P. Vetter, *Die Metrik des Buches Job*, 1897; H. Grimme, *Theolog. Quartalschrift*, 1898, pp. 295 ff., 421 ff., 1899, 112 ff., 259 ff.; Sievers; Honth. 44–70. Bu.'s Comm. contains much detailed criticism of Bi.

[2] See $3^{4.5.6.9}$ 4^{16} 5^{5} $6^{4.10}$ 7^{11} 8^{6} 9^{24} $10^{1.17(?).22}$ $11^{6.10f.}$ $12^{3.4.6.12.17}$ $14^{4f.7.12.13.14.19}$ $15^{28.30}$ ($17^{1.11}$) 18^{4} $19^{12.27.29}$ 20^{23} $21^{17.33}$ $24^{5.12.13.14.18(20).24}$ 26^{14} $28^{3.4.28}$ 30^{3} $31^{7.34}$ $33^{15.23f.}$ 34^{37} $37^{21.23}$ 38^{41} 39^{25}.

[3] See, *e.g.*, p. 30 on the four tristichs in 3^{1-10}.

examples of 3 : 2 (several with the echoing parallelism characteristic of this rhythm: see, *e.g.*, 8^{21} 12^{17} 18^{18} 27^{21} 29^{5} 33^{22} 36^{14} 37^{9} 38^{9} 39^{3}), to which a few more might be added, for example, two in 7^{21}. But 40^{24} is very questionable proof that 2 : 3 was used. Of 4 : 3 a dozen examples are referred to in the same note; and of these, too (add $4^{2.10}$ and 29^{18}), a few are likely to be original, though several are open to serious doubt on one ground or another. Even possible instances of 3 : 4 are very rare (phil. n. on 21^{16}, p. *147*: cp. 29^{6}, p. *200*). The examples of 4 : 4 are few: however, see 3^{3} 15^{20} 22^{18} 27^{13} 29^{4} 34^{29}, but 15^{23} 21^{28} and 23^{9} are all doubtful (see phil. nn.). The rhytnm 2 : 2, *i.e.* a single period of four stresses divided into equal parallel lines, is very rare; but 10^{6} seems a secure example of it: 19^{14} is much more doubtful (see phil. n.).

PART I.

TRANSLATION AND COMMENTARY.

I. II. The Prologue.—This consists of a prelude, 1^{1-5}, two scenes in heaven, 1^{6-11} and 2^{1-6}, two series of consequences to Job on earth of what had been determined in heaven, 1^{13-22} 2^{7-10}, and a conclusion, 2^{11-13}. The prelude depicts Job at the height of his prosperity, rich in children and possessions; in the conclusion, Job is seen, not for any fault in him, but for reasons revealed to the reader though concealed from the sufferer and his friends, deprived of children, possessions, and health, and thus brought to such a degree of adversity as to stupefy into silence the very friends who had come to comfort him. The writer relies on repetition rather than variation for emphasis and effect; for it is the repetitions rather than the slight variations, in so far as these latter are original, that are prominent in the account of the scenes in heaven, the descriptions of Job's character ($1^{1.8}$ 2^{3}), and his constancy (1^{22} 2^{10}), and in the words of the messengers (1^{14-19}); and yet along with this use of repetition, there is an almost more striking effect of concentration and compression. In these two brief chapters the long and peaceful earlier life of Job, and the series of tragic actions of what threatens to be its close, are alike, though briefly, yet vividly depicted with sufficient fullness for the writer's purpose, but with a severe neglect of all that is unessential.

Two things the writer intends to stand out: the character of Job and his prosperity; the one as constant, the other as passing; the one as esssential, the other as accidental. The

I. [1] There was (once) a man in the land of Ūṣ, whose name was Job. That man was perfect and upright, fearing God

---

wealth and the fortune of Job grow, culminate, vanish; the character of Job remains intact. Without his character Job is nothing; without his wealth he remains everything. But it is with this *constancy* of character, not the growth or formation of it, that the writer is concerned; how Job's wealth came is indicated, how it vanished is described; how his character was formed is not even indicated: but that it existed before his wealth is implied, and how it endured through prosperity and in adversity is depicted. In the interest of these two themes, the changing fortunes and the enduring character of Job, the restraint in the choice of detail and the repetitions are alike employed. A modern writer would almost certainly have depicted, even within the scope of the Prologue, character as well as fortune developing, the two in action and reaction; the ancient writer does not.

I. 1–5. The character and wealth of Job.

1. The name and country of the hero of the story are given (a), and then immediately the writer passes to the main point—the character of Job (b);—this was completely good, and so, on the current theory, explained his great wealth, but made his deprivation of wealth a riddle. *There was* (*once*) *a man*] cp. 2 S. 12^1, and see phil. n.—*Ūṣ*] One of the tribes who together made up "the children of the East" (^{3}): the land of Uṣ lay to the East of Palestine, but whether in the Hauran, or farther south on the confines of Edom, cannot be certainly determined (see Introduction); and it has been suggested (Bu. p. xi) that even to the writer himself it was a wide and vague term. Be this as it may, the writer had a clear idea of the *nature* of Job's country: it lay on the confines of the desert (^{19}; cp. $^{15.\ 17}$) to the E. of Palestine (^{3}), yet in a district of great farms (^{14}), and near a town (29^7; cp. 2^8 n.). Job was at once a great sheep-master, like Mesha of Moab (2 K. 3^4), a great agriculturist, and a man of great influence in the town.—*Job*] strictly *'Iyyōb*: see further, on the name, Introduction.—*That man was*] the tense is frequentative, the following tense (^{2})

consecutive: first the character, then, and in consequence, the children and the wealth. But the children are all grown up, and the sons at least settled in houses of their own: this character of Job is, therefore, carried far back, and throughout the long years it had habitually manifested itself. Job, like Noah before the Flood (Gn. 6^{9} P), like Abraham (Gn. 17^{1} P) and Jacob (Gn. 25^{27}—JE or ? R), is complete, sound, free from defect, and, in this sense, *perfect* (*tām*, ^{8} 2^{3} 8^{20} $9^{20.\ 21.\ 22}$ and six times † outside the book of Job; *tāmīm*, 12^{4} 36^{4} 37^{16}, and nearly ninety times † elsewhere). A satisfactory single rendering for the adj., which will preserve in English the connection with the corresponding substantives (*tummah*, $2^{3.\ 9}$ 27^{5} 31^{6}, also Pr. 11^{3} †; *tōm*, 4^{6}, also Pr. 2^{7}, Ps. $26^{1.\ 11}$ al.), is difficult to find; EV. renders the adj. by *perfect*, the subst., excellently, by *integrity*. Used as ethical terms these nouns and adjectives describe rather generally the good as contrasted with the bad man: thus one or other of them is used combined, or in synonymous parallelism, with ישר, *upright* (n. or adj.), in Ps. 37^{37} 25^{21}, Pr. 2^{21} 28^{10} (?) 29^{10} (?) (cp. 1 K. 9^{4}, Pr. 2^{7}); with צדק (n., adj., or vb.), *righteous*, in 9^{20} 12^{4}, Ps. 7^{9}, Gn. 6^{9}, Pr. 11^{5} (cf. c. 22^{3} $27^{5f.}$, Ps. 15^{2}); with אמת, *fidelity, truth*, in Jg. $9^{16.\ 19}$, Jos. 24^{14}; with נקה, *to be innocent*, in Ps. 19^{14} (cp. Gn. 20^{6}); they are used in antithesis to מרעים, *evil doers* in 8^{20} (cp. Ps. $64^{5\,(4)}$ after $^{3\,(2)}$); רשע, *wicked*, in $9^{20.\ 22}$, Pr. 11^{5} 28^{12}; אנשי דמים, *blood-guilty men*, in Pr. 29^{10}; and (implicitly) *'iḳḳesh*, *twisted*, in 9^{20}, Pr. 10^{9} 19^{1}, Dt. 32^{5} (after v.^{4}). Noticeable also is the association of being *tāmīm* with walking before God in Gn. 17^{1} (cp. 6^{9}); and of those whose way, or conduct, is perfect (תמימי דרך), with "those who walk in the law of Yahweh" (Ps. 119^{1}). In so far as the terms retain the special meaning suggested by the common meaning of the root alike in Hebrew and Arabic, they refer to the *completeness* of the character; in Job *tām* does not mean *perfect* in the sense of absolutely sinless, for Job, who maintains that he is *tām* (27^{5}, cp. 2^{9}), admits the presence in himself of the sins common to humanity (13^{26} $14^{16f.}$, cp. 14^{4}, if original); but it is more than ἄμεμπτος (𝔊), "blameless" (RVm. in Gn. 6^{9}); it implies a character that is complete, all of a piece, not, as the

and avoiding wrong. 2 And so there were born to him seven sons and three daughters. 3 And his cattle came to be

---

Satan and after him the friends insinuate, one thing on the surface and another within; it is a character that seeks its ends openly, along the one true path, not like the *'iḳḳesh* trickily, by crooked and devious paths; or, in a figure used by the writer himself, the *tām*, or *perfect* man, is one whose character is full-weight: "let me be weighed in correct scales that God may recognize my integrity," *i.e.* that I am full weight (31^{6}).—*Upright*] another of the frequently recurring ethical terms for the good man: *yāshār* etymologically describes the good man as straight, straightforward; it commonly occurs combined or in parallelism with other wide ethical terms such as *tām* (see last n.), נקי (4^{7} 17^{8}), זך (8^{6}), צדיק (*e.g.* Ps. 33^{1} 140^{14}); in 1 S. $29^{6ff.}$ the term expresses the idea of loyalty. As the first adj. applied to Job associates him with Noah, Abraham, and Jacob, so does the second with the Hebrew ideal of conduct as expressed in the title "the book of the upright" for the collection of early poems, and the national epithet Yeshurun (see *Numbers*, p. 347). At the same time there is nothing exclusively Jewish associated with either term; for Abimelech of Gerar acts in the integrity (*tom*) of his heart (Gn. 20^{5}), and Achish of Gath and the Philistine princes set store by the quality of uprightness (1 S. $29^{6ff.}$).—*Fearing God*] this, rather than the distinctively Jewish phrase *fearing Yahweh*, is chosen, and is even used in the speech of the Satan to Yahweh in v.^{9}; cp. "the fear of God" (Gn. 20^{4}), "the fear of the Almighty" in 6^{14}. Corresponding to the fear of God, as the principle of conduct, is the habit of *avoiding evil* (cp. 28^{28}, Pr. 3^{7}), *i.e.* not the abandonment of evil courses previously followed (an idea otherwise expressed at least in Is. 1^{16}), but the resolute rejection of the opportunities to evil which life offers; so in Pr. 13^{19} "to avoid evil" is the antithesis to the satisfaction of (evil) desire; cp. also Is. 59^{15}, and, though less obviously, Ps. 34^{15} 37^{27}. Evil is avoided by constant adherence to the path of right (Pr. 4^{27}). Job's life had offered many opportunities of wrong-doing (cp. c. 31), but he had refused to use them.

seven thousand sheep and goats, and three thousand camels, and five hundred yoke of oxen, and five hundred she-asses,

---

2, 3. The ideal character of Job was rewarded with ideal good fortune—many children, the majority of whom were sons (the foundation of a man's strength and security: Ps. $127^{3ff.}$ 128), vast numbers of sheep and goats, of camels for distant journeys and transport, of asses and oxen for work in the fields, and many slaves. The addition of child to child, and the increasing multitude of his live-stock as the years passed, were recurring tokens of God's approval of Job's constant character. The recurrence of the numbers seven, three (in sum, ten), and of five and five (again, in sum, ten), symbolize the perfection of Job's wealth. Nabal, who was "a very great" (1 S. 25^{2}) man, had 4000 sheep and goats as against 7000 assigned here to Job. And Job's possessions are not exhaustively described, for there is no direct reference to his arable land, v.^{14} 31^{38-40} (though the "oxen" suggest agriculture: cp. 1 K. 19^{19-21}, 2 S. $24^{21f.}$, Dt. 22^{10} 25^{4}) or to other forms of wealth, such as gold (cp. Gn. 13^{2}).

3. *Cattle*] The term (מקנה), though etymologically wide and applicable to possessions of all kinds, is, with one or two doubtful exceptions, such as Gn. 49^{32}, limited in usage to possessions of cattle (see *Lex.*).—*Sheep and goats*] expressed in Hebrew by a single collective term (צאן), inadequately rendered by EV. "sheep," or sometimes, less inaccurately, "flock": so Gn. $30^{31f.}$, a passage which proves the extent of the term in Hebrew. A single term sufficed to cover the two classes of animals, inasmuch as the flocks generally contained both sheep and goats, as they commonly still do to-day. So Doughty (*Arabia Deserta*, ii. 234) records the contrary as exceptional: "we soon saw a great flock trooping down—and unlike all that I had seen till now, there were no goats in that nomad flock." Cp. Robinson, *Biblical Researches*, ii. 169, 180.—*She-asses*] the she-ass (cp. Gn. 32^{15}) is more valuable than, in modern Syria costing three times as much as, the male (Wetzst. in Del.). The number of Job's male-asses is not given—an indication that his wealth even in cattle is not

and very numerous slaves. And so that man became greater than any of the sons of the East.

4 His sons used to go to one another's houses, and each

---

exhaustively stated. The terms used for sheep and goats, and for oxen, are collective, and as such include females; the masc. pl. used of the camels is applicable also to females (Gn. 32^{15}). — *The sons of the East*] a wide term for the inhabitants of the country to the E. of Canaan; see Introduction. In some cases the nomadic tent-dwellers of the Syrian desert are intended (Jer. $49^{28f.}$, Ezk. $25^{4.\,10}$); here, and probably in 1 K. 5^{10} (4^{30}), the term at least includes the settled house-dwellers in (rich) agricultural country on the confines of the desert.

4, 5. A picture of Job's past life before the opening of the main story (cp. c. 29). It serves in part to illustrate Job's position: his numerous sons live an ample life in houses of their own; but its main purpose is to give an example of Job's constant fear of God. The numerous frequentative tenses (see phil. n.) indicate that it had (long) become habitual with the children to entertain one another at a series of banquets; and that it had become a habit with Job to turn aside by means of burnt-offerings any anger of God which they might at such times have aroused by unbridled act or thought.

4. A banquet (משתה)] was so called from the prominence at such feasts or banquets of drinking (cp. Is. 25^{6} 5^{12}), which led at times to excessive drunkenness (1 S. 25^{36}, Jer. 51^{39}); such banquets were given at the weaning of a child (Gn. 21^{8}), a wedding (Gn 29^{22}, Jg. 14^{10}), a birthday (Gn. 40^{20}), sheep-shearing (1 S. $25^{2ff.\,36}$, 2 S. 13^{27} 𝔊), and doubtless on other special occasions; but the term implies neither the ordinary meal of daily life,[1] nor the sacred meal eaten before Yahweh at the great annual festivals.[2] Is it meant, now, that what was exceptional with other people was constant with Job's children, that every day in the year (𝔊 καθ' ἑκάστην ἡμέραν) they sat down and drank and made merry (so Da. Du. Peake)? or only that, as opportunities incident to their life, such, *e.g.*, as

[1] So Del. here. [2] So Ew. here.

on his day to give a banquet: and they used to send and call
their three sisters to eat and to drink with them. [5] When
they had completed a round of the banqueting days, Job sent

---

sheep-shearing, presented themselves, they made a habit of keeping a week (cp. Jg. $14^{12.\,17}$) of banquets, the eldest entertaining on the first day, and so on to the youngest, who would entertain on the last day of the festal week (so, in the main, Bu. Di.)? Nothing in the text very directly decides those questions, certainly not the last clause of [5] to which Du. appeals, for in view of the first clause of that v. *all the days* cannot in any case mean every day in the year, but simply all the days that concluded a week spent in banqueting. On the other hand, the first clause of[5] would read a little unnaturally, if the writer really meant that all the days of the year were banqueting days; and again a daily invitation to the sisters is less probable than an invitation sent as often as, after an interval, a banqueting week was approaching; see also on [13].—*On his day*] the day on which it fell to him to entertain: scarcely *his* (*birth-*)*day* (cp. 3^1), for the banqueting-days were apparently ([5]) a round of seven successive days, which the birthdays of the seven would not naturally have been.—*To call their three sisters*] the sisters may be thought of as still unmarried and in their father's house to which their brothers *send*, as in turn Job sends from his house to the houses of his sons. But the writer may as little have thought distinctly of this point as of the family affection which the invitation to the sisters suggests to some commentators, or of the easy or loose manners which Du. infers from it; or of all the brothers being unmarried (Du.); the last point, if intended, would find a very partial analogy in David's sons Amnon and Absalom each living, though unmarried, in houses of their own (2 S. $13^{7.\,20}$); for seven adult sons of a single mother—and Job is represented as a monogamist—to be all unmarried would be flagrantly out of keeping with the social customs of the time and country. In any case such details are immaterial to the purpose of the story; and it is wiser not to press the inferences.

and consecrated them, his habit being to rise up early in the morning, and to offer burnt-offerings for them all, one for each.

---

5. *Sent and consecrated them*] terse to obscurity. The consecration in question is the preparation by ritual washings and the like (cp. Gn. 35^{2}) for participation in some sacred ritual (cp. Ex. $19^{10.\,14}$, Jos. 3^{5} 7^{13})—here, as is generally supposed in the ritual of the burnt-offerings on the next morning. So Samuel (1 S. 16^{5}) calls on Jesse and his family to consecrate themselves, and himself consecrates them, that they may participate with him in a sacrificial meal. Some (Di. Bu. Peake) suppose that Job sends and summons or brings his children to his house, and consecrates them there; others (Fried. Del.) that Job sends a priest to consecrate them in their own homes. B. Jacob (*ZATW*, 1912, p. 278) suggests that קדש was synonymous with קרא and meant to invite some one (cp. 𝔗: see phil. n.) to make himself ritually ready for, and to come to, a feast; and that what is meant in ^{5b} is that at the end of the round of secular meals in the sons' houses, Job *sent and invited* the children *to a sacred meal* in his own house, and that on the morning after this meal Job offers sacrifice against sins of thought (for other sins the children would not have ventured in their father's presence) which might have been committed in his own house, so compromising him. But the parallelism of קדש and קרא in Jl. 1^{14} 2^{15} 4^{9} does not prove that the two vbs. were so completely synonymous that קדש included the sense of invitation; and if a meal in Job's house had been intended, it would probably have been more clearly indicated. *To offer burnt-offerings*] after the manner of the patriarchs in JE (Gn. 8^{20} $22^{2.\,7.\,13}$ 31^{54}), Job as the head of the family, without the assistance of any priest, offers sacrifice; also in accordance with early custom he offers for an expiatory purpose (cp. 2 S. 24^{25}) burnt-offerings (cp. 42^{8}), not the more special sin-offerings of later times—a want which 𝔊 supplies.—*For them all, one for each*] lit. *according to the number of them all*; *i.e.* ten, if "sons" include the daughters (cp. Gn. 3^{16}, Ex. 21^{5} 22^{23}, Jos. 17^{2}): otherwise, seven.—*Cursed*] Hebr. *blessed*—a euphemism or scribal correction for *cursed*: see phil. n.—*In their*

For Job said, "If haply my sons have sinned, and cursed God in their heart." So used Job to do on all the(se) days.

---

heart] unless we can adopt Jacob's suggestion noted above. Job fears sin committed by the children in their own homes; but so sure is he of the character of his children that even when they are out of his sight and control he fears only that they may commit some unintentional sin or sins that are stifled before they issue in speech or outward action. Yet such is Job's fear of God that he is careful to counteract the mere possibility of even such sins as these.—*On all these days*] on the morrow of the last day of each week of feasting.

6–12. **The first scene in heaven**: the Satan questions the disinterestedness of Job's religion.—The scene, though not explicitly defined, is, like that in which Mastêmâ questions the whole-hearted devotion of Abraham to God (Jub. $17^{15f.}$), clearly heaven: it is here that the "sons of the gods" present themselves before (על) Yahweh, who is pictured, as the prep. probably implies, seated (on a throne): so in a companion picture (1 K. 22^{19}) Yahweh is depicted "sitting on his throne and all the host of heaven," which correspond to the "sons of the gods" here, "standing before him (עמד עליו) on his right hand and on his left," and ready (1 K. 22^{22}), as here (1^{12} 2^{7}), to go out (יצא) from the divine assembly, and affect human affairs according to the will or permission of Yahweh. Cp. also Zec. 6^{5} "the four winds of heaven going out from presenting themselves before (יצאות מהתיצב על) the Lord of the whole earth." Since the Satan does not report immediately and alone, but presents himself along with the other sons of the gods (2^{1}), it may be inferred that Yahweh was conceived as holding a session at stated intervals for the dismission of his messengers to earth, and for the reception of reports from them on their return.—*The sons of the gods*] "the sons of God" (EV.) is grammatically an equally legitimate rendering, and might be compared with "sons of the Most High" (בני עליון, Ps. 82^{6}), but whether interpreted offspring of the one true God, or beings dependent on, but sharing the spiritual nature of the one true God, this rendering fails to reproduce the Hebrew con-

6 And there was a day when the sons of the gods came to present themselves before Yahweh; and the Satan came also

---

ception. "The sons of the gods" (בני האלהים) are individuals of the class god, as "the sons of man" (בני האדם, 1 S. 26^{19}) are individuals of the class man: cp. also "the sons of the prophets," meaning members of a prophetic guild. Consequently the same class of beings who are called "the sons of the gods" (בני (ה)אלהים, 2^{1} 38^{7}, Gn. 6^{2}; בני אלים, Ps. 29^{1} 89^{7}: cp. בר אלהין, Dn. 3^{25}) can also be called simply "gods" (אלהים, Ps. $82^{1.6}$: cp. אלם (point אֵלִם) in Ps. 58^{2}). The phrase is traceable to a stage of thought in which Yahweh was not supreme or *sui generis*: the class of gods like that of men was numerous, though members ("sons") of the two classes were sharply distinguished in appearance (Dn. 3^{25}) and manner of life (Ps. $82^{6f.}$). But within this class Yahweh, to this writer, is absolutely supreme; Yahweh is not a man, but one of the *elohim*; and yet not merely any one of the *elohim*, but that one who is in absolute control of all other *elohim*, as also of all men and of the affairs of the whole world. There is as little suggestion here in the Prologue as in the speeches of the earlier Hebrew thought, that Yahweh's power and authority were limited to certain areas, and that other gods shared with Him the control and allegiance of men (cp. *e.g.* 1 S. 26^{19}); on the other hand, the sons of the gods, including the Satan, are completely subordinate to Him, and act, not on their own initiative or authority, but on His; like Him in contrast to men they are *elohim*, or holy (15^{15} 5^{1}), but no less than men they are His servants (4^{17-19}). As employed by Him in the administration of human affairs, these beings are termed angels (מלאכים, *ib.*). 𝔊, therefore, in rendering here *οἱ ἄγγελοι τοῦ θεοῦ* (so 2^{1}, cp. 38^{7}), gives a substantially correct equivalent of the entire Hebrew phrase, though not an exact equivalent of either of the terms that compose it.—*The Satan*] here, as in Zec. $3^{1.2}$, with the article, and therefore not yet, as it virtually has become in 1 Ch. 21^{1} (without the article), a proper name. But here and in Zec., no less than in Ch., though in these three passages only in the OT., the term denotes a distinct and permanent

among them. [7] And Yahweh said to the Satan, Whence comest thou? And the Satan answered Yahweh, and said,

---

personality, who was thus designated originally in reference to his function of opposing or accusing (cp. 𝔊's διάβολος) men before God, before he had developed his later character (Ch., NT.) of tempter or instigator of men to act in opposition to God. The force of the word is well shown in Nu. 22^{22} where the angel of Yahweh becomes for the occasion a *saṭan* in order to *oppose* Balaam and to stay his course; or somewhat differently in Ps. 109^{6} where opposition in the sense of accusation before a legal tribunal is intended (cp. v.[20] where שֹׂטְנַי is parallel to הדברים רע על נפשי): cp. also 1 S. 29^{4}, 2 S. $19^{23\,(22)}$, 1 K. $5^{18\,(4)}$ $11^{14\text{ff.}}$. Here the Satan opposes Job by endeavouring to overthrow his good standing with God (cp. the antithesis between the vb. שטן and the phrase "to seek our good" in Ps. 38^{21}), not as in Zec. by drawing Yahweh's attention to actual sins which He is prepared to pardon and remove, but by suggesting unworthy motives in a man in the outward manifestations of whose life even he can find no fault. See, further, on the history and development of the term, art. "Satan" in *EBi.*—*Came also among them*] not as a being of a different class, but as himself one of the sons of the gods: בתוך is not infrequently tantamount to: (one) of the number of, with others of the *same* class (see Gn. 23^{10} 42^{5}, Nu. 17^{21} 26^{62}, 1 S. 10^{10}, Ezk. 29^{12}). But as in several of the passages just cited the person or persons in question are peculiar or pre-eminent in the class to which they are referred, so is the Satan here: he is one of the sons of the gods, or angels, and as such subject to and under the control of Yahweh and incapable of acting beyond the terms of His permission; but there are perhaps germs of the later idea of Satan, the opponent of God, dividing with Him the allegiance of men (Wisd. 2^{24}), in the freedom with which he here moves about in the earth, so that Yahweh asks where he has been (^{7} 2^{2}), in contrast to the angels who are *sent* to definite persons and places.

7. *Whence comest thou*] if the implication of the question is as just suggested, the Satan is the "vagabond among the

From going hither and thither in the earth, and walking to and fro in it. [8] And Yahweh said to the Satan, Hast thou considered my servant Job, that there is none like him in the earth, a man perfect and upright, fearing God and avoiding wrong?

---

heavenly beings" (Da.). Others find in the question a distinction between the angels to whom superintendence of special nations and countries was entrusted by Yahweh (Dt. 32[8] 𝔊, Dn. 10[13. 20f.], Sir. 17[17]), and the Satan whose function confined his energies to no fixed region of the earth, and who "in his unresting service of Yahweh has been visiting all parts" of the world (Peake).—*From going hither and thither*] the vb. (שוט) may be used of roving aimlessly or distraught (Jer. 49[3], Hithp., and, if correctly restored there, Gn. 24[63]); but it occurs more frequently of movement hither and thither within a given area and with a definite purpose, which requires something more than direct passage from one point to another: so the Qal is used of the manna-gatherers (Nu. 11[8]) and the census-takers (2 S. 24[8]), and the intensive Poʿlel of movement in diligent search for information (Jer. 5[1], Am. 8[12]); so the eyes of Yahweh, moving hither and thither in the whole earth, put him in possession of complete information of all that goes on there (Zec. 4[10], 2 Ch. 16[9]). It is in this sense that the vb. is used here in combination with התהלך, which is similarly used at times of so *walking to and fro* in a given area as to leave nothing undiscovered (Zec. 1[10f.]: cp. 6[7], Jos. 18[4. 8]). Thus the Satan, if a vagabond, is yet a vagabond with a purpose: he scours the earth, leaving no corner unvisited, that he may discover the failings of men.

8. Of course, the Satan in his complete tour of discovery ([7]) must have come across Job; but has he devoted his attention to ((שים לב על(אל: cp. *e.g.* 2 S. 18[3], Ex. 9[21]; with ל, 1 S. 9[20], Ezk. 40[4]) him, and to the fact that here, at least, is a man against whom no accusation can be brought? or, is it for that very reason that he, unlike Yahweh, has found no further interest in him?—*That*] rather than *for* (EV.); so 2[3]. —*There is none like him in the earth*] this goes beyond [1]: Yahweh endorses the judgment of Job's character in the narrative, and, by an addition, enhances the startling nature

[9] And the Satan answered Yahweh, and said, Is it for nothing that Job has feared God? [10] Hast not thou thyself made a hedge about him, and his house, and all that he hath everywhere? the work of his hands thou hast blessed, and his cattle hath increased in the land. [11] But stretch forth thine hand now, and touch all that he hath: surely he will curse thee to thy face. [12] And Yahweh said unto the Satan, Behold, all that he

---

of the change of fortunes that is to come: Job's piety, according to the narrative (1–3), had led to his being prosperous beyond all the children of the East; as certified by Yahweh, it would justify his being the most prosperous man in the earth, and so, on the current theory, makes him the least likely object in the world of a disastrous change of fortune.

9. The Satan admits what he must, but no more. Up till now, Job has feared (ירא, pf., not the part., for note the order: cp. Dr. § 135 (4)) God, but the future may reveal even outward failings; and, as it is, his piety is probably a mere *quid pro quo*. Yahweh has given a good price to the man for the life which pleases Him so much; and the man has had the sense not to imperil a good bargain by failing in his part of it.

10. *Thou thyself*] (אַתְּ for אתה; *Lex.* 61*b*) emphatic: the hedge, which surrounds and screens Job and his children and his possessions, has been made by none other than God Himself, and for this reason must remain unbreached—unless God Himself can be induced to breach it, and let in destruction (cp. Is. 5^{5}).—*Cattle*] [3] n. Here mentioned as the principal part for the whole of Job's wealth.

11. *But* (an emphatic adversative, see phil. nn. on 13^{4} 33^{1}) let Yahweh reverse His treatment, and Job will certainly reverse his conduct; when piety no longer pays, Job will become defiantly profane. Yahweh may think that He has found a man good all through: the Satan knows better, and confidently challenges Yahweh to bring the matter to a test.—*Touch*] hurtfully or destructively (נגע ב), as 19^{21}, 1 S. 6^{9}, and (with a human subj.) Gn. 26^{11}, Jos. 9^{19}, Zec. 2^{12}, and (of the wind) c. 2^{19} (RV. "smote").—*Curse*] lit. *bless*, as [5] (n.).

12. Yahweh accepts the Satan's challenge, and on the

hath is in thy hand; only against himself stretch not forth thy hand. And the Satan went out from the presence of Yahweh.

Satan's terms, except that He delegates to the Satan the work of destruction, instead of performing it Himself; the reservation that Job's person is not to be injured is within the terms of the challenge; at present (ct. 2[4f.]) the Satan is confident that the destruction of Job's children and property will suffice to turn this pattern of piety into a profane person; and Yahweh empowers him to do what he likes with all that Job possesses. To speak of the "rapidity and coldbloodedness" with which Yahweh, in accepting the challenge, gives up his favourite to torture, or of lack of omniscience in Yahweh, making it necessary for him to test Job's disinterestedness (Du.), is not very helpful: everything in the Prologue moves rapidly, and is told with few words; nor would it have eased the situation to have shown Yahweh being gradually compelled to give up His servant to trial. That He does allow him to be tested, and, though righteous, to suffer, is simply the unexplained *fact* of life, as the author observed it, but which the current theory denied.—*In thy hand*] as Gn. 16[6]: cp. c. 8[4].

13-22. Job bereft of children and wealth.—The Satan uses his power to the full: in a single day Job loses everything, but he maintains the integrity of his character. With simple but effective art the writer heightens the impression of the suddenness and completeness of the calamity. The opening v. of the section depicts afresh the old ([4]) careless, happy life of Job's children; and leaves us to think of Job still tranquil and unexpectant of evil up to the very point when the first messenger of ill comes ([14]). The calamities are only described through the mouth of the messengers; they all happen on the day that has begun, as so many days before, quietly and happily for Job and his children; each messenger is the sole survivor of the calamity he describes; each messenger after the first arrives before his predecessor has completed his tale of woe. Within a single day all the calamities happen; within a few moments Job receives the news of them. The first message, like the paragraph as a whole, begins ([14]) with a

[13] And there was a day when his sons and his daughters were eating and drinking wine in the house of their eldest

---

peaceful, familiar picture of Job's cattle ploughing, then suddenly ([15]) this picture is completely wiped out—for ever. The next two messages at once suggest a new calamity with their opening words: "the fire of heaven fell"; "the Chaldæans made three bands": the last, like the first, begins with an old familiar scene—the children banqueting; but this, after the recital of so much calamity, only heralds the last and crowning stroke, and by recalling the happier days, for ever ended, only adds to the poignancy of this final message. The alternation of human beings (the Sabæans and the Chaldæans, [15. 17]) and the elements of nature (the lightning and the hurricane from the desert, [16. 18]) as the instruments of calamity is noticeable. The last calamity is obviously the greatest: the third—the loss of three thousand camels—more severe than the second (seven thousand sheep and goats); the second perhaps also more severe than the first (a thousand kine and five hundred she-asses). As the section opens with a picture of the old life on its sensuous side, so it closes with the picture of the new life, brought about by the calamities, on its spiritual side—Job deprived of all, naked of all outward belongings, as when he issued from his mother's womb, but maintaining his fear of God and his God-approved character.

13. *His sons*] though Satan is the person last named, the writer uses the suffix in reference to the main person of the story. 𝔊: *the sons of Job*, a correct and obvious interpretation rather than a difference of text.—*A day . . . in the house of their eldest brother*] the first day of a week of banqueting (cp. [4]). If every day of the year was a banqueting day with Job's children, the day of calamity is a day on which Job had offered expiatory sacrifices for the preceding week ([5]), and the day may be specified so as to bring Job's godliness and his calamity into the closest connection (Dav.), or so as to prevent the calamity being attributed to unexpiated sins of Job or his children (Du. Peake). If, however, the periods of banqueting were separated from one another by intervals, the point is that the Satan chose the first opportunity, when all the children were gathered into

brother: [14] and a messenger came to Job, and said, The oxen were plowing, and the asses were feeding beside them: [15] and

---

one house, to use the authority given him to destroy them by one fell blow (so Bu.). An interval between the Satan's departure from heaven and his destructive activity on earth is rather suggested by the insertion of the clause, And there was a day (cp. [6] 2^1): ct. 2^7, where we have, "he went out and smote," without any such intervening clause.

14. *Were plowing*] the season is winter.—*The asses*] fem., as in [8]: see n. there.

15. *Sheba*] in 6^{19} the travelling companies of Sheba are closely associated in synonymous parallelism with the caravans of Tema. Sheba (שְׁבָא) is the name of the South Arabian (cp. Gn. 10^{28} J) people whose capital was Marib, about 45 miles east of San'a, and about 1200 miles south of Jerusalem. The Sabæan inscriptions, discovered and deciphered within the last century, record many kings of Sab'a (סבא = Heb. Sheba שבא) and the buildings of these kings and others in later times continued to bear witness to the wealth and power of ancient Sheba. The remoteness of Sheba, its trade in frankincense, gold, and precious stones, and its wealth, are the subjects of most of the OT. references (1 K. $10^{1ff.}$, Is. 60^4, Jer. 6^{20}, Ezk. 27^{22}, Jl. 4^8, Ps. $72^{10.15}$—all, with the possible exception of 1 K. $10^{1ff.}$, as late as or later than the end of the 7th cent. B.C.). The association with Dedan in Gn. 10^7 25^3, Ezk. 38^{13}, and with Tema (*c.* 350 miles south of Jerusalem and 230 miles north of Medina) in 6^{19}, and the reference to Saba in inscriptions of Sargon (Gen. inscription l. 32: Rogers, *CP*, p. 332), and in the Minæan inscription cited below, have been thought to point either to a northern home of Sheba prior to their settlement in southern Arabia, or to the existence of trading stations of the South Arabian Sheba in northern Arabia and "in the neighbourhood of Edom" (Dr.). The present is certainly the only passage in the OT. which represents Sheba as raiders or, as some would put it more definitely, as "Bedouin of the northern desert" (Skinner, *Genesis*, p. 203); but a Minæan inscription (Gl. 1155) records the thanks of the donors to 'Athtar of Ḳabḍ for the

Sheba fell (upon them), and took them, and the young men they smote with the sword; and I only have escaped alone to tell thee. [16] This one was still speaking, when another came and said, The fire of God fell from heaven, and burnt up the sheep and goats, and the young men, and consumed them; and I only have escaped alone to tell thee. [17] This one was yet speaking, when another came and said, Kasdim formed (themselves into) three companies, and made a raid upon the camels, and took them, and the young men they smote with the sword; and I only have escaped alone to tell thee. [18] This one was yet speaking, when another came and said, Thy sons and thy daughters were eating and drinking wine in their eldest brother's house:

---

deliverance from Sab'a of their caravan with their camels and possessions, on its return from Mṣr (Egypt?), and perhaps during its passage through northern Arabia. According to one theory (Glaser) this inscription dates from *c.* 1100 B.C.; according to another and more probable theory (Hartmann), however, the inscription refers to the Medes (*i.e.* the Persians) in Egypt, and accordingly dates from the time of Cambyses (*c.* 525 B.C.). On Sheba, see, further, Ed. Glaser, *Skizze der Gesch. u. Geog. Arabiens*, ii. 399ff.; Hartmann, *D. islamische Orient*, ii. 130ff.; D. S. Margoliouth, *Sheba*, in *DB*.—*The young men*] *i.e.* the servants (נערים as Nu. 22[22] and often) in charge of the cattle: of these the messenger alone escapes.

16. *The fire of God*] *i.e.* lightning, but lightning of extraordinary destructiveness, since it burns up and consumes the whole of Job's large flocks and all the shepherds with them, except only the messenger that escapes. The fire of God is on this occasion directed by the Satan: Yahweh having permitted the end, the destruction of Job's possessions ([12]), permits the use of the means.

17. *Kasdim*] or the Kasdim (see phil. n.). The term is that commonly rendered Chaldæans; but the Chaldæans, who formed the nucleus of Nebuchadnezzar's army and empire, would appear here even more strangely than in 2 K. 24[2], where we read of marauding "bands of Kasdim, and bands of Aram (? read Edom), and bands of Moab, and bands of the

[19] and, behold, a great wind came (sweeping) across the wilderness, and smote the four corners of the house, and it fell in upon the young men, and they died; and I only have escaped alone to tell thee. [20] And Job rose up, and rent his robe, and

---

sons of Ammon," let loose on Judah to destroy it. In both these passages the Kasdim are rather (Aramæan: cp. Gn. 22^{22} with Skinner's n. there) nomads, whether ultimately connected with the Kasdim (Chaldæans) of Babylonia or not: cp. Wi. *AOF* ii. 250 ff. Che. (*EBi.* 968, 2469) substitutes Kushim for Kasdim. These marauders, whoever they were, formed into three companies so as to attack from three sides, and so the more easily to prevent the escape of the camels.

19. *The wilderness*] The great desert stretching across from the eastern confines of Palestine to the Euphrates valley. The violence or destructiveness of the east wind (the sirocco, 15^2 27^{21}), or, as it is here called, the wind *from the other* (*i.e.* eastern) *side of the wilderness*, is elsewhere referred to: see Hos. 13^{15}, Jer. 4^{11} 18^{17}; here the wind is a whirlwind which strikes all four corners of the house.—*The young men*] Job's children, both sons and daughters (cp. 29^5), together with their attendants: see phil. n.

20. Job has received the messengers seated (cp. 1 S. 4^{13}, 2 S. $18^{24ff.}$): their messages have followed one another without a moment's interval, so stunning Job that he does not interrupt them; but when the last has spoken he rises from his seat and, still apparently without spoken comment on the news, rends in a moment his outer garment in token of his sudden distress (cp. 2 S. 13^{19}), and then performs the customary mourning rite of shaving the head so as to make it bald (cp. Am. 8^{10}, Is. 15^2 22^{12}, Jer. 16^6). The latter rite cannot have been momentary; Job must have gone himself, or sent another, in search of the necessary instrument. Consequently *and he fell to the ground* does not describe an immediate half-involuntary physical reaction against the distressing news (Dr.: cp. 1 S. 28^{20}), but an act of reverential obeisance or worship; so, *e.g.*, with man as the obj. and, as here, followed by *worship*, in 2 S. 1^2 9^6 14^4, Ru. 2^{10}, with God as obj. 2 Ch. 20^{18},

shaved his head, and he fell on the ground, and worshipped, and said,

21 Naked came I forth from my mother's womb,
And naked shall I return thither:
Yahweh gave, and Yahweh hath taken away;
Blessed be the name of Yahweh.

---

cp. Jos. 5^{14}. The implied object of obeisance is Yahweh: but what follows is not a prayer to Him (for He is referred to in the 3rd pers.), but a confession in the presence of the messengers of Job's entire dependence on God, and of his acquiescence in His dealings with him.—*His robe*] the *m^e'îl* (of Jb. 29^{14}: of the friends, 2^{12}) was the outer garment worn above the tunic—especially the outer garment of men of position; so of Jonathan, 1 S. 18^4; of Saul, 1 S. 24^5; of Samuel, 1 S. 28^{14}; of the high priest, *e.g.* Ex. 28^{31}; of Ezra, Ezr. 9^3. See, further, *EBi.* 2933 n.

21. Cp. Gn. 3^{19}, Ec. $5^{14(15)}$, 1 Ti. 6^7. Owning nothing Job (like all men) came into life, carrying nothing with him he will leave it and descend to Sheol; life and all that it had brought him (^{2L}) were the gift of Yahweh; at death at latest he must have left all these gifts behind—Yahweh who had given would then have taken them away; He has done so earlier, as He had an absolute right to do; nevertheless Job does not curse, as the Satan had expected, but blesses the name of Yahweh. To ancient Hebrew thought the state after death was not identical with that before birth; but, as compared with the rich activity of life on earth, the thin and unsubstantial life after death in Sheol was not very different from the absence of life that preceded birth; so Job in 3^{13-16} plays on the similarity of the two states; and so here, as elsewhere, expressions that, strictly speaking, would imply identity of the states before birth and after death are employed, without that precise implication being intended by the writer. With *thither*, cp. *there* in $3^{17.19}$; with *return*, cp. 30^{23}, Ps. 9^{18}. To infer from *thither* that *my mother's womb* means the womb of mother earth (cp. Ps. 139^{15}) is mistaken (cp. Nöldeke in *Archiv f. Religionsgeschichte*, viii. 161–166); and had the writer intended his

22 In all this Job sinned not, nor charged God with unworthiness.

II. 1 And there was a day when the sons of the gods came to present themselves before Yahweh; and the Satan came also among them. 2 And Yahweh said to the Satan, Whence comest thou? And the Satan answered Yahweh and said, From going hither and thither in the earth, and walking to and fro in it. 3 And Yahweh said to the Satan, Hast thou considered my servant Job, that there is none like him in the

---

mother's womb in the first line, and the womb of mother earth in the second, he would doubtless have expressed the idea as clearly as Ben Sirach (40^1). In this saying Job uses the name Yahweh; for the rest, in the Prologue as in the Dialogue, the human speakers use the term God ($1^{5.16}$ $2^{9.10}$), though the narrative regularly employs Yahweh; see Introd.

22. *In all this*] viz. all that happened, or that Job had thought or done, or perhaps *in spite of all this* (בְּ as Is. 9^{20}). Job, true to his character, avoided sin.—*Unworthiness*] see phil. n.

II. 1–6. The second scene in heaven closely resembles the first, and is largely described in identical language: here as there the sons of the gods with the Satan among them come before Yahweh:[1] Yahweh puts the same question to the Satan, and receives the same answer,[2]—but the same answer under different conditions: the Satan avoids reporting the effect of the permission given to him at the last assembly. Yahweh repeats His second question,[3] but now with an addition, bringing out, what the Satan has not been ready to volunteer, that Job's character has stood the strain of calamity, and that the Satan's insinuation against it had not been justified. Thus challenged, the Satan, with the same assurance as before, claims that it is only necessary to attack Job's own person, to plague him with disease, in order to make him curse God,[4.5]. Yahweh permits the Satan to try the further experiment, and he departs, [6.7a].

1. *Among them*] 𝕳 + *to present himself before Yahweh*: see phil. n. **2.** = 1^7. **3a.** = 1^8.

earth, a man perfect and upright, fearing God and avoiding wrong? and he still holds fast his integrity, and yet thou hast enticed me against him to destroy him without cause. [4] And the Satan answered Yahweh, and said, Skin for skin, yea, all that a man hath will he give for his life. [5] But stretch forth

---

3b. *And he still holds fast . . . and yet*, etc.] or, perhaps, . . . *and so in vain hast thou enticed me to destroy him*: see phil. n.—*Integrity*] or, *perfection*; see n. on *perfect* in 1^1, and on *integrity* in 27^5.—*Destroy*] the same vb. (בלע) with a similar sense occurs in 10^8: cp. also 8^{18} 37^{20}, Is. 3^{12} 19^3, 2 S. $20^{19f.}$.—*Without cause*] cp. 9^{17} in a similar connection; so also 1 S. 19^5 and often. For the sense, *in vain*, see Pr. 1^{17}, Mal. 1^{10}.

4. *Skin for skin*] "the meaning apparently is: a man will sacrifice one part of his body to save another, an arm, for instance, to save his head, and he will similarly give all that he has to save his life: Job's resignation (1^{21}), therefore, is not disinterested: it is still not shown that he serves God 'for naught' (1^9)"; so Dr. following 𝔗 Rashi, Ibn Ezra, Del. The objection has been raised to this that עור does not denote a member of the body. Numerous other interpretations of the phrase *skin for skin* have been offered: it was probably a proverbial saying, and, as such, to those who were familiar with it, it would have enforced the following clause; to us its origin and associations are unknown, and its meaning can only roughly be determined by what follows. On the force of the prep., see phil. n. Among other interpretations that have been offered, there may be mentioned: (1) Leave Job's skin unbroken, and he will so leave you yours (Olsh.): if this were correct, the language of the Satan would indeed be "rather vulgar" (Peake: cp. Du.)—indeed to Del. this seemed too indecent even for the Devil; otherwise the language, as in $1^{9.10}$, is cynical, but hardly vulgar; (2) like for like a man readily gives up, how much more his outward possessions for life and health (Ew. Di.); (3) the skin of an animal or of his children a man gives up to save his own: so Ros. Hupf. Da. Du., who think the proverb arose in circles in which skins were an important article of exchange. Similarly Dhorme (*RB*, 1914, 128 f.), who, however, suggests that the

thine hand now, and touch his bone and his flesh, surely he will curse thee to thy face. [6] And Yahweh said to the Satan, Behold, he is in thy hand; only preserve his life.

[7] And the Satan went out from the presence of Yahweh, and smote Job with malignant ulcers from the sole of his foot

---

skin was not itself the unit of exchange, but stands—the part for the whole—for what was, viz., the animal; "skin for skin," therefore, means "animal for animal," *i.e.* "money (cp. *pecunia* from *pecus*) for money"; (4) one skin surrounds another; a man can give up one skin, *i.e.* much, and yet have another, *i.e.* something, left: against Di.'s objection that the figure of men having two skins is untrue, Bu. appeals to the Arabic use of *bašarat* for the outer; *'adamat* for the inner skin; (5) see on v.[6] end.

5. Beneath the skin lie bone and flesh; let Yahweh smite Job's body, and that, too, more than skin-deep, with disease. For the bones as the seat of disease, see, *e.g.*, La. 1[13]; for the flesh, Is. 10[18].

6. As before (1[12]), Yahweh meets the Satan's wish to the full, and gives him permission to do all that he has asserted will suffice to show up Job. Before, as he had then asked, Job's possessions, now Job's body is put in his power; the only limitation imposed this time is that Job must not be killed outright. The limitation is necessary in order to allow of the experiment being carried through; but the use of the same word נפשו, *his soul* or *life*, at the end of [4] and [6] is awkward, and is perhaps due to the first occurrence of the word belonging to the proverb cited by the Satan, which most have limited to "skin for skin"; in this case it would be tempting to read עורו ו for עור ו, and render (another) skin for (*i.e.* to save) his own skin, yea, all that he hath will a man give for (*i.e.* to save) his life, עורו and נפשו thus being parallel expressions.

7–8. Job smitten with malignant disease.—The Satan this time immediately (ct. 1[13]) works out his will on Job, and the scene in heaven dissolves into the picture of Job suddenly smitten with a malignant and loathsome disease that leaves no corner of his body sound. The disease is not named, but here

a single prominent symptom, and elsewhere in the book many other symptoms are indicated. These have commonly been supposed to indicate elephantiasis, a disease so named from the swelling of the limbs and blackening of the skin which disfigured the sufferer, so that his limbs and skin resemble those of an elephant. The term שחין occurs also, qualified as here by the adj. רע, in Dt. 28^{35}, qualified by the gen. "of Egypt" in Dt. 28^{27}, and without an adj. in 2 K. 20^{7} = Is. 38^{21} (of Hezekiah's sickness, which was treated with a fig-plaister), in the phrase שחין אבעבעת פרח באדם ובבהמה used of the Egyptian plague in Ex. 9^{9-11}, and lastly, in the law of leprosy in Lv. $13^{18-20.\,23}$ †. It is not clear that in all these passages שחין indicates the same disease: Dr. Macalister, for example (*DB* iii. 229 f.), holds that the Egyptian plague may have been small-pox, Hezekiah's sickness (bubonic) plague, and Job's the Oriental sore; the last suggestion Dr. Masterman (*PEFQuSt*, 1918, p. 168) finds highly improbable, since the Oriental sore is "commonly a single lesion and never a general eruption"; Job's disease was rather "a very extensive erythema." The term *sh*ᵉ*ḥîn*, from a root which in Arabic (saḫuna) means *to be hot*, *inflamed*, and in Aram. (shᵉḥan) *to be warm*, appears to have denoted inflamed eruptions of various kinds, and here, as the next v. suggests, such an eruption as discharges purulent matter and produces itching; the discharge and the subsequent crusting over of these eruptions are referred to in 7^{5}. Other symptoms of Job's disease are the maggots bred in the ulcers (7^{5}), the fetid breath (19^{17}), the corrosion of the bones (30^{17}), the blackening and falling off of the skin (30^{30}), feelings of terror (3^{25} 6^{4c}), and by night terrifying dreams and nightmares (7^{14} n.; cp. 7^{4}). There are also many allusions to intensity of pain and to groanings and cryings out; and 7^{15} is commonly taken to refer to the feeling of strangulation that is a symptom of elephantiasis, and 2^{12} to the disfigurement that is so prominent a characteristic of that disease. See, further, for a discussion of the symptoms and of the diseases to which they have been considered to point, Dr. on Dt. $28^{27.\,35}$ and Ex. 9^{9}; *EBi.* articles Boil and Leprosy; *DB* iii. 329 f.: the commentaries on this passage of Stickel, Del. Di., and the references there given. The

to the crown of his head. [8] And he took for himself a potsherd to scrape himself with, as he sat among the ashes.

---

writer may or may not have had a single disease in mind throughout; but, in any case, we must beware of extending to Job's case irrelevant symptoms of the disease: for example, elephantiasis develops slowly, and often lasts some years before death ensues; but the narrative almost certainly intends us to understand that Job was immediately smitten with intensely painful and loathsome symptoms, attacking every part of his body, and, as the discussion proceeds, death does not appear far off.

8. Job already, when the disease smites him, sitting among the ashes, as a sign of mourning (cp. 42^6, Jon. 3^6, Is. 58^5), additional to those mentioned in 1^{20}, takes up a potsherd lying there and uses it to allay the intolerable itching caused by the disease. So taken, [b] is a circumstantial clause of a normal and very frequent type (Dr. § 160). The v. has also been translated: *And Job took for himself a potsherd to scrape himself with. And* (*as*) *he was sitting among the ashes,* [9] *his wife said to him*, and, were this correct—though it would naturally be expressed by ואשתו אמר, or the like, instead of ותאמר (cp. *e.g.* $1^{18b.\,19}$ and Dr. §§ 165–169)—Job first retired to the ashes *after* being smitten with disease, whether as a further means of allaying the itching (*DB* iii. 329), or because the ash-heap or hill was the proper place for lepers. In the latter case certainly *the ashes* would be the mound of burnt dung lying outside the town (𝔊 τῆς κοπρίας ἔξω τῆς πόλεως). Still a conspicuous feature of the Hauran towns and villages, such a mound is now termed *mezbele*, and is vividly described by Wetzst. (in Del.): "The dung . . . is carried in baskets in a dry state to that place outside the village, and there generally it is burnt once a month. . . . The ashes remain. . . . If a place has been inhabited for centuries, the *mezbele* attains a height far greater than that of the place itself. The rains of winter reduce the layers of ashes to a compact mass, and gradually convert the *mezbele* into a solid hill of earth. . . . The *mezbele* serves the inhabitants of the place as a watch-tower, and on sultry evenings as a place of concourse, for on this height there is a

9 Then his wife said to him, Art thou still holding fast thine integrity? curse God, and die. 10 And he said to her, As one of the impious women wilt thou speak? shall we receive *good*

---

breath of air. . . . There lies the outcast who, smitten by loathsome disease, is no longer admitted to the dwellings of men. . . . There lie the dogs of the village, gnawing perhaps some fallen carcase, such as is often thrown there."

9, 10. Job's wife, like Adam's (Gn. 3), becomes, even if unwittingly, "diaboli adiutrix" (Aug.); subtle psychological analyses, however, whether to heighten or diminish her weakness, are probably as foreign to the author's intention as the lengthy harangue attributed to her by 𝔊, the translator, "feeling, no doubt, nature and propriety outraged, that a woman should in such circumstances say so little" (Da.) as in 𝔐. Her terse question serves to bring out the uniqueness of Job's character: many others of more ordinary character might well have failed at this point (cp. Is. 8^{21}, Rev. 16^{11}): Job stands fast. Once again, it is best to think of the wife's question as following, not long (𝔊), but immediately after the disease has attacked Job; the symptoms hold out no hope of alleviation and recovery; let Job therefore curse God and take the penalty, death (1 K. 21^{10}, Lv. $24^{11ff.}$; cp. Ex. $22^{27\,(28)}$), as preferable (cp. 7^{15}) to life under present conditions.—*Integrity*] see n. on [3].

10. Job rejects the impious advice, yet in terms suggesting that his wife may have offered it unthinkingly, not fully realizing its enormity. Her speech is, in fact, nothing less than impious; and, if spoken intentionally, she herself must be an impious woman. But Job neither says directly that she has spoken impiously, nor that she is an impious woman: he rather implies that she has spoken, under momentary stress, as any one of a class to which she did not normally belong: cp. similar locutions in 2 S. 3^{33} 13^{13}, Jg. 16^{7} (Samson will become again what he had not been, *like one of mankind*, *i.e.* like any ordinary man).—*Impious*] the Heb. *nābhāl* (30^{8}, 2 S. 3^{33} 13^{13}, Pr. $17^{7.\,21}$ 30^{22}, Jer. 17^{11}, Ezk. 13^{3}, with the references cited below) does not mean, though it is often so rendered in EV.,

from God, and shall we not receive evil? In all this Job sinned not with his lips.

---

foolish or *fool*; for "the fault of the *nābhāl* was not weakness of reason but moral and religious insensibility, an invincible lack of sense or perception, for the claims of either God or man. The term is thus applied to Israel unappreciative of Jehovah's benefits (Dt. 32^{6}), to the heathen (v.^{21}, Ps. $74^{18, 22}$), to the man that cannot perceive that there is a God (Ps. 14^{1}). Isaiah states explicitly what he understands by the *nābhāl*: he contrasts him (32^{5}) with the 'noble' or 'liberal' man, and adds (v.^{6}), 'For the senseless man speaketh senselessness, and his heart worketh naughtiness, to practise profaneness, and to utter error against Jehovah, and to make empty the soul of the hungry, and to cause the drink of the thirsty to fail'; the description is that of a man who is at once irreligious and churlish (cp. 1 S. 25^{25}). . . . The corresponding subst. [נבלה] *senselessness* is used of acts of profanity (Jos. 7^{15}), churlishness (1 S. 25^{25}), and immorality (Gn. 34^{7}, Dt. 22^{21}, 2 S. 13^{12}; and elsewhere)"—Dr. *Parallel Psalter*, p. 457.—*Wilt thou speak*] or *canst thou speak* (cp. Dr. § 39), as you have done just now, or *oughtest thou to have spoken* (cp. 10^{18} with phil. n., 2 S. 3^{33}) are better renderings than *thou speakest*, for the idea is certainly not, thou speakest habitually and so now also impiously. Possibly (see phil. n.) the text originally had a pf. tense: *As one of the impious women hast thou spoken.*—*Job sinned not with his lips*] did not speak sinfully as the Satan (^{5}) had been confident that he would. There is no emphasis on "with his lips," and there is no implication that Job sinned otherwise than with his lips, viz. in his heart (*Baba Bathra*, 16*a*): Ehrlich well cites the parallel phrase *not to sin with my tongue* in Ps. 39^{2}.

11–13. **Job's three friends** come from their several countries to comfort Job.—It is clearly implied that some time elapsed between Job's last calamity ($^{6-10}$) and the arrival of his friends: for first the news has to reach each of them in their several homes, which lay some distance from one another; then, as ויועדו implies, they communicated with one another and fixed on a rendezvous from which they should proceed in com-

11 And the three friends of Job heard of all this evil that had come upon him. And they came each from his own place—Eliphaz the Temanite, and Bildad the Shuḥite, and Ṣophar the Naʿamathite. So they met together at the place agreed upon to come to show their grief for him and to comfort him.

12 And they lifted up their eyes afar off, and they did not recognize him. And they lifted up their voice, and wept: and they rent each his robe, and tossed dust upon their heads towards heaven. 13 And they sat down with him on the ground

---

pany to Job's home, and then the journey itself must have taken some time. With this implication of the Prologue allusions in the speeches agree; for in 7^{3} Job speaks of months of pain already past: cp. 7^{4} $30^{16f. 27}$ and, indeed, the entire tenour of c. 30 and $19^{1. 3-20}$.

11. *Place*] in the sense of home or country: cp. Nu. $24^{11. 25}$.—*Eliphaz the Temanite*, etc.] on the names of the friends and their homes, see Introduction.—Teman lay in Edom, and was proverbial for its wisdom (Jer. 49^{7}); Shuaḥ was a tribe belonging to the "East" (Gn. $25^{2. 6}$); Ṣophar's home is quite uncertain.—*They met together*, etc.] for the vb., cp. Am. 3^{3}, Neh. $6^{2. 10}$, Jos. 11^{5} (of allied kings meeting at a fixed place for the opening of a campaign), Ps. 48^{5}.—*To show their grief*] from the primary physical sense *to move to and fro* (1 K. 14^{15}, Jer. 18^{16}), the vb. (נוד) seems to have come to mean *to make gestures* (of grief); cp. Jer. 22^{10}, weep not, nor make gestures (of grief) for him; and then, with a weakening or loss of the physical sense, *to manifest grief*, *to solace* (cp. the noun in 16^{5}), *to commiserate*: so, *e.g.*, Jer. 15^{5} 48^{17}, and coupled (as here), or in parallelism with the vb. נחם, 42^{11}, Is. 51^{19}, Ps. 69^{21}, Nah. 3^{7}.

12. Condensed. The friends catch sight of Job, a conspicuous object on the lofty ash-mound outside the city (^{8}), while they are still some distance away. When they draw near enough to discern his features, they find them marred by disease beyond recognition (cp. Is. 52^{14}); when, in spite of this, they know that it really is Job, they break out into weeping, and toss quantities (see phil. n.) of dust on their head in token of distress (cp. Jos. 7^{6}, 1 S. 4^{12}, 2 S. 13^{19}, La. 2^{10}, Ezk. 27^{30}).

for seven days and seven nights: but none spoke a word to him, for they saw that the pain was very great.

---

13. For a whole week the friends show their sympathy by sharing with Job his seat on the ash-mound; but, overwhelmed by the greatness of his suffering, they speak no word: even at the end of the period, it is not they but Job who breaks the silence.—*The pain*] EV. "grief," but probably with the meaning of "pain": cp. Shakespeare's "grief of a wound," see Dr.'s n. Here physical pain is intended by the noun כאב, as most obviously by the vb. in 14^{22}, Gn. 34^{25}: cp. also Jb. 5^{18}, Ezk. 28^{24}.

III. In the first moments and days of his troubles, Job still remembered and praised God for the happiness of his former life (1^{21} 2^{10}): God still filled his mind. But months have now passed (see on 2^{11-13}); and his misery is already of long standing. How great that misery is the advent of his friends seven days ago, and their attitude since, have but served to make clearer; they came to express their grief in words, but having found Job's calamities beyond the power of words to express or mitigate, they have kept silence. Job does not reproach them for this, regarding their silence as perhaps the best substitute for a comfort (cp. 21^{2}) which circumstances do not allow them to give him. But for the time being they are almost beyond his thought or attention: so, too, has God become. Thus when, in the presence of his friends, he breaks the long silence, it is in a speech which, like cc. 29–31, but unlike those that intervene, is addressed neither to his friends nor to God. He is absorbed with two thoughts—his misery and the wherefore of it: his misery, though so relatively recent, has blotted out all sense of former happiness, and so completely obsesses him that his life from the very day of his birth now seems to him to have been mere wretchedness and pain ($^{3-10}$): his misery is so intense that it needs no foil of happier times remembered (cp. 29) to set it off: it is such that Sheol itself is by comparison with it to be longed for or welcomed ($^{11-19}$). Why, then, is life thrust upon him and others wretched like himself? ($^{19-26}$). In the last section the wider question is put first ($^{20-22}$),

III. [1] After this Job opened his mouth, and cursed his day.
[2] And Job answered and said:

---

and is followed by the particular ($^{23-26}$): why must the wretched live, and why Job in particular? This order flows naturally out of the preceding section in which Job, expressing his longing for death, has had occasion to refer to the different classes who meet in the realm of death—princes, masters, the great, whose life raises no wherefore? and the toil-worn, petty, servile folk, whose life is intolerable. Why are these last born at all? Thus Job, though absorbed with his own misery and the mystery of it, is not so absorbed as to regard his fate as singular; rather has his own trouble deepened his fellow-feeling with the wretched: in the days of his prosperity he had been anything but unsympathetic towards them, for he had helped the victims of misfortune ($4^{3f.}$); but in those days their lot had not presented to him a problem, now it does (cp. 4^{5}). Why are there weak, stumbling, miserable men to be helped and comforted? Why are men born to grow up to such conditions as these? This question must ultimately raise that of God's responsibility: what does God mean by creating and maintaining such lives? But in this first speech Job does not clearly and directly raise the question in this form, though God may perhaps be the unnamed subject in ^{20}, and in ^{23b} the one place in the chapter in which God is mentioned, it is at least hinted that (but ct. the explicitness of 10^{18}) He is the source of Job's troubles, and of the moral perplexities which they occasion; but, for the most part, it is the bare fact of misery, and the question whether such misery, however caused or to whatsoever due, ought to be, that are considered. Just as God is kept at least somewhat in the background, so also is any moral distinction in men of differing fortunes: not here or yet is the question clearly formulated, why do the *righteous* live miserably? It is the wider question that is put: Why are men allowed to be wretched? Why are they born at all, if to live is to suffer? V.[1] (prose) connects the prose Prologue (cc. 1–2) with the speech (poetry), in which Job opens the succession of speeches (poetry) of himself and his friends extending down to c. 31.

V.^{2} is the usual formula introducing a speech: so 4^{1} 6^{1}, etc.

1. *Day*] *i.e.* birthday, which is elsewhere otherwise expressed (v.^{3}, Gn. 40^{20}, Jer. 20^{14}, Ec. 7^{1}).

2. *Answered*] as often, not of reply to any previous remarks, but of beginning to speak as an occasion required (*Lex.* 773*a*, 2).

3–10. Job curses the day (^{3a}) of his birth (cp. Jer. 20^{14-18}), and the night of his conception (^{3b} 𝔐, not 𝔊), praying that they may both be blotted out of existence. Personifying the day and night in question, he treats them as possessing independent and continuous existence, so that they have hitherto reappeared every year: his wish is that they may now cease to exist, and henceforward appear no more.

The verse division of 𝔐, followed by RV., in this opening section of the poem, gives four tristichs ($^{4.5.6.9}$) and four distichs—an extraordinary proportion of the former, even though we do not with Bi. Du. rule out the possibility of tristichs. The tristichs of $^{4.5}$ could be most easily removed, and distichs restored, by transposing $4^{b.c}$. Bi.[1] assumes the loss of a line after ^{4a}, unites ^{5c} with ^{6a} (omitting "that night" in ^{6a}), and expands ^{9a} into a distich. Du. transfers ^{9b} to follow ^{4a}: this yields a good distich, and improves rather than spoils ^{9}; of $^{5.6}$, like Bi., he makes three distichs; and certainly $^{5a.b}$ would stand well as a complete distich, and $^{6b.c}$ better by itself than tacked on to ^{6a}; moreover, $^{5c.6a}$ would form a good distich except that the *casus pendens* at the beginning of the *second* line is not very natural; on the other hand, if we simply omit "that night" in ^{6a}, with Bi. Du., the line is reduced to two stresses, though, by reading ויקחהו for 'יק, Bi. is able to satisfy his system. It must, however, also be observed that, as it stands, ^{6a} is over long (four stresses). On the whole, the tristichs remain suspicious, even though no attempt hitherto made to remove them is beyond criticism: the same may be said of "that night" in ^{6}, and also of "Lo, that night" in ^{7}. It has sometimes been claimed on the basis of 𝔐 (for variations in 𝔊, see below) that the special curse on the *night* of conception ($^{6-10}$) is twice as long as that on the *day* of birth ($^{4.5}$), and the reason for this has been very artificially found, and against the standpoint of the context, in the fact that it was the night of conception which properly gave Job being. The quatrain theory of Bi. and Du. leads them to obscure the really rather obvious and effective articulation of the passage, since they are bound to unite ^{4a} (Du. + ^{9b}) with ^{3} and (Du.) $^{9b.c}$ with ^{10}. As a matter of fact, in a single opening distich (^{3}) the writer defines the day and night he has in view, and in a single closing distich (^{10}) gives the reason for his curse; what lies between amplifies the single word of malediction (יאבד) in ^{3a}. Had the writer really been bound by a system of quatrains he could easily, and we must believe would, have expended $^{3.10}$ each into a quatrian.

3 Perish the day wherein I was born!
And the night which said, A man is conceived!

---

3. *And the night which said*] The night is personified, and so able to bear witness to what had happened in it: the poet even, if 𝕳 be right, endows it with the faculty of knowing what no human being could know, the sex of the child at the moment of conception.—*A man is conceived*] 𝕲 Behold a male! (see phil. n.)—referring to Job's *birth*. If this reading is correct, the poet will first use day in its broader and more general sense, and then in the parallel clause specify the particular part of the "day" meant by him, viz. the first half of the *νυχθήμερον*.—Thus, whereas according to 𝕳 the night of conception as well as the day of birth is cursed, according to 𝕲 the day of birth is the sole object of the malediction. "These objections have been urged against 𝕳 (Be. Du.): (1) in [1] only Job's birthday is mentioned as having been cursed by him; (2) in the sequel it is only this day that he curses (notice especially [7b. 11b]); (3) he is unlikely to have spoken of the same night as both the time of conception and ([6. 7]) the time of birth; (4) גבר is a poet. word for *vir adultus*. Job was neither born nor conceived as a גבר; (5) Jer. (20[14–18]) curses only the day of his birth, and uses the term זכר, *male* ([15]). On the other hand, (1) [1] in any case does not summarize the whole ch.: if it does not summarize the whole, it need not mention more than the first and most prominent part of it; (2) and (3) it is quite possible that [6–10] refer to the night of conception; and even if they do not, a glance ([3b]) at the time of conception is very natural and fitting in Job's position; (4) Job is speaking as a poet, not as a physiologist; and he may well use the term man (cp. *ἄνθρωπος*, John 16[21]), 'looking at what he essentially is, not at the stage of development he has reached' (Pe.). Even, however, though גבר be still deemed inappropriate, זכר might be accepted without הנה; (5) whatever be the original, the terms used by Jer. do not decide those which may have been used by Job. On the whole, though 𝕲 may be right, 𝕳 is not necessarily wrong." In addition to the considerations thus carefully balanced by Dr. there is yet

4 That day—let it be darkness!
Let not God inquire after it from above!
Neither let the light shine upon it!
5 Let darkness and black gloom claim it!
Let a cloud dwell upon it!
Let the blacknesses of the day terrify it!

---

another that weighs heavily in favour of 𝔊: Job's quarrel is not with his conception, but with his birth, with the fact that he had issued from the womb living into the world with its life of trouble and pain; to have been conceived, yet not to have been born, is indeed one of the two alternative fates—the silence of the womb or the silence of Sheol—that he desires; if his mother had miscarried, or he had been still-born, all would still, even in spite of his conception, have been well with him ($^{16.\ 12}$; cp. $10^{18.\ 19}$).

4–5. If it is too much for Job to expect his birthday to be blotted out of the year (^{3}), may it at least, when it comes round, be a day of blackness, uncared for by God, unreached by His light, affrighted by appalling, preternatural obscurations!

4. *That day*] "𝔊 *that night*,—no doubt a paraphrase due to 'day' being understood to refer to that part of the day which it must have referred to, if ^{3b} were understood, as 𝔊 understood it, of Job's *birth*" (Dr.).—*Let not God inquire after it*] viz. to give it its light when its time comes; let Him be indifferent to it, and leave it a day of darkness.—*Neither let*, etc.] as a consequence of God's not caring for it.

5. *Black gloom*] צלמות, the strongest word which Heb. possesses to express the idea of *darkness*. If the rendering *shadow of death* (so 𝔐) is correct, the meaning will be darkness as intense as that of the abode of death, Sheol (Ges. *Thes.* "*tenebræ Orci*, i.e. *tenebræ densissimæ*"; cf. $10^{21.\ 22}$ 38^{17}): if, however, it is to be regarded, with most moderns, not as a compound, but as an independent word (see phil. n.), it must be rendered by some other expression denoting intense darkness (RVm. *deep darkness*).—*Claim it*] The word (גאל) means properly to *claim effectively* property the possession of which has lapsed (*i.e.* to *redeem* it); the right, or duty, of doing this devolved

[6] That night—let thick darkness take it!
Let it not rejoice among the days of the year!
Into the number of the months let it not come!
[7] Lo, that night—let it be sterile!
Let no joyful voice come therein!
[8] Let them curse it that ban the day!
Who are ready to rouse up Leviathan.

---

commonly upon the owner's nearest relation (the גֹּאֵל: see Goel in *EBi.*); hence the idea is, as soon as the day appears, let darkness, as its nearest relation, at once assert it rights, and take possession of it.—*The blacknesses of day*] Let it not merely be taken possession of by ordinary darkness: let the appalling and abnormal obscurations, produced by eclipses, tornadoes, sandstorms, etc., such as are apt to darken the day, make it a day not of darkness only, but of terror. Cf. the descriptions of the "day" of Yahweh, Zeph. 1^{15}, Joel 2^{2} al.

6. *That night*] Bi. Du. omit (see above on $^{3-10}$). Honth. *that day.*—*Take*] with the implication of *take away* (Gn. 5^{24}), so that it can no more take its place in the year. *Seise on* (EVV.) does not quite express the right *nuance.*—*Rejoice among*] let it have no part in the band of happy days that make up the year. 𝔗, vocalizing differently, has *be united to* (so AV. Hi. Me. Bu. Du. Sgf.): this is supported by the parallelism of the next clause; but the thought is more prosaic (Dr.; so Di. Pe.).

7. "While other nights ring with birthday gladness, let it sit barren" (Da.); let not there ever be heard in it the joyful sound of one announcing to the father the good news of the birth of a son and gladdening his heart thereby; cp. Jer. 20^{15} (בשר and שמח שמחהו).—*Sterile*] גלמוד, *stony*, stone-barren, unproductive as the rock (Arab. *jalmud*, a *rock*, or *mass of rock*) 15^{34} 30^{3}, Is. 49^{21}. Not the usual Heb. word for barren (עקרה).

8. *That ban the day*] enchanters or magicians reputed to have the power to make days unlucky,—either in general, or, in particular (cp. [b]), by producing eclipses, the day on which an eclipse occurred being considered inauspicious.—*To rouse up Leviathan*] *i.e.* the dragon which, according to ancient ideas,

9 Let the stars of its (morning-) twilight be dark!
Let it wait for light, but have none!
Neither let it look upon the eyelids of the dawn!

---

was supposed—and in many parts of the world is supposed still (see, *e.g.*, E. B. Tylor, *Primitive Culture*,^{3} i. 328 ff.)—when an eclipse occurred, either to swallow up the sun, or moon, or to surround it in its coils; an allusion to this idea is detected by some in 26^{13}. Leviathan (לִוְיָתָן), properly something *wreathed* or *coiled* (cp. לִוְיָה, a *chaplet*, Pr. 1^{9} 4^{9}), and denoting apparently the crocodile in $41^{1\text{ff.}}$ ($40^{25\text{ff.}}$). The crocodile, a symbol of Egypt in Ps. 74^{14}, and a sea-monster in Ps. 104^{26}, is here an imaginary serpent-like monster, represented as stirred up to produce the eclipse by the incantations of the professional cursers. The ethnic parallels do not, however, furnish us with instances of attempts to make the eclipse-monster swallow the sun and so produce eclipses, but only of attempts to make it disgorge or let go of the sun, and so prevent or end eclipses. Du. explains differently: as in $^{5a.\ b.\ 6a}$ he sees not ordinary darkness, but the darkness of chaos (Gn. 1^{2}), which, rising up out of the deep, like a heavy cloud (^{5b}), may, Job hopes, overwhelm his birthday; so here in Leviathan he sees the chaos-dragon (Tiāmat) who, as a personification of the powers opposed to light, threatens the world of gods and men with destruction. When the enchanters disturb this monster, the *tohu wabhohu*—the chaos which Jer. $4^{23\text{ff.}}$ so finely describes—threatens to break forth and engulph the day on which this takes place. A mythological allusion of this kind might readily occur in Job (cp. 7^{12} 9^{13} $26^{12.\ 13}$); but it may be doubted whether this explanation does not put more into Job's words than they naturally express. Gu. (*Schöpf. u. Chaos*, p. 59), Che. (*JQR*, 1897, p. 975; *ET* x. (1899) 380) Be. would read: "that lay a spell upon the *sea*" (יָם for יום); but this introduces an idea foreign to the context.

9. Let its morning stars, Venus and Mercury, the harbingers of day, never appear! Let it remain an endless night waiting for a dawn that never breaks. The idea is fully expressed in ^{a} and ^{c}, the stricter parallels, and ^{b} may be out of place (see

10 Because it shut not up the doors of my (mother's) womb,
Nor hid travail from my eyes!

above).—*Twilight*] *nesheph* denotes the *evening* twilight in 24^{15}, Pr. 7^{9} al., and the *morning* twilight, as here, in 7^{4}, Ps. 119^{147}.—*Wait for*] EVV. have the expressive rendering *look for* (so elsewhere, *e.g.*, Is. 59^{11}, Jer 13^{16}); but the figure is not in the Heb., קוה meaning simply *to wait*.—*The eyelids of the dawn*] a beautiful figure repeated, or imitated, in $41^{10(18)}$: the first crimson streaks of light which herald the rising sun; cp. Soph. *Ant.* 103, χρυσέας ἁμέρας βλέφαρον.

10. *Shut not up*, etc.] like similar but not identical phrases in Gn. 16^{2} (עצרני מלדת), 20^{18} (עצר בעד רחם), 1 S. 1^{5} (סגר ר'), ^{6} (סגר בעד ר'), the phrase סגר דלתי בטני, *to shut the doors of the womb*, might here refer to prevention of conception, as פתח רחם, *to open the womb*, in Gn. 29^{31} 30^{22} means to render conception possible; in this case the subj. would be the night on which Job was conceived. But the phrase would obviously be equally suitable to the closing of the womb against the egress of the embryo; in this case the day (or night) of Job's birth (cp. ^{b}) is the subject, and the poet is giving a special turn to an idea that occurs elsewhere (Is. 37^{3} 66^{9a}). It can scarcely be more than an accident that the closing of doors, when mentioned in the OT., generally has in view the prevention of ingress (*e.g.* Gn. 19^{10}, Neh. 6^{10}, Is. 45^{1}) and rarely the prevention of egress (? 38^{8}).—*My (mother's) womb*] Heb. *my womb*, *i.e.* the womb which bare me: so, though other views have been taken, 19^{17}.—*Travail*] Heb. עמל, properly *labour* (Qoh. 1^{3} 2^{10} etc.; Ps. 90^{10}), *toil* (cp. the vb. Ps. 127^{1}); hence fig. *travail* (EVV. usually *trouble*), Ps. 10^{14} 25^{18} etc., Is. 53^{11} (cp. the adj. below, v.^{20}): when prepared by the wicked for others, generally rendered in EVV. for distinctness *mischief* (15^{35}, Ps. $7^{15.17(14.16)}$ $10^{7.14}$ etc.).

11–26. To the curse succeeds the questioning and complaint, in two unequal paragraphs, each beginning with "wherefore"—$^{11-19}$ (nine distichs) and $^{20-26}$ (seven distichs). The curse reveals Job's deep and passionate judgment of the facts of his life: it is travail, travail so bitter that the day that

11 Why did I not die from the womb,
Come forth from the belly, and expire?
12 Why did the knees receive me?
Or why the breasts, that I should suck?
13 For then should I have lain down and been quiet;
I should have slept; then were I at rest:

---

failed to prevent this existence deserves the severest malediction. But malediction does not alter the fact; Job is alive, and Job's life is travail. Why? If he was not to perish in the womb ([16]), but to come out through its doors into the world of life, yet why, even so, did he not die at once, before he could become conscious of the travail of life? Why ([11f.]) the bitter mockery, as it seems now, of his parents' welcome to him and care for his infant life? That care had robbed him of the great prize ([21f.]) of death, and had forced on him misery ([20-26]) in place of the stillness and peace of death ([13-19]). Job disregards here (see introductory note to the ch.) not only the long years of happiness that he had previously enjoyed, but also the drearier aspects of Sheol, which elsewhere he could vividly portray. At present his mind is filled with the thought of life as travail, and death as rest.

11. Du. may be right in placing [16] immediately after [11] (see phil. n.). The two verses would then read together thus:

Why did I not die from the womb,
Come forth from the belly, and expire?
Or (why) was I not like a hidden untimely birth,
As infants which never saw the light?

From the womb] *i.e.* immediately after birth. 𝔊 "in the womb" is not to be preferred.

12. *The knees*] commonly explained of the knees of the father, on which the newborn child was laid as a mark of acceptance and legitimation; cp. Gn. 50^{23}.—*Receive me*] Prop. *come in front of me, come to meet me*—with some service or kindness (*e.g.* Dt. 23^{5}, with food).

14–15. He would, moreover, instead of being an outcast, lying in squalor, and an object of contempt to all ($19^{13ff.}$ $30^{1.\ 9ff.}$),

14 With kings and counsellors of the earth,
Who built ⌜pyramids⌝ (?) for themselves;
15 Or with princes that had gold,
Who filled their houses with silver:
16 Or as an hidden untimely birth I had not been;
As infants which never saw light.
17 There the wicked cease (their) raging;
And there the weary be at rest.

---

have at least been in the company of the wealthy and illustrious dead.—*Counsellors of the earth*] 12^{17}.—*Pyramids*] MT. has, "who built up waste places for themselves" (so Σ), *i.e.* who *re*-built ruined cities or habitations (so Is. 58^{12} 61^{4} al.), that they might inhabit them themselves. This, however, yields a poor sense; kings do not usually attain fame by *re*-building ruined sites. חרבות may be an error for היכלות, *palaces* (Be.), or (Ol. Di.) ארמנות, *fortified palaces*; or (Ew. Bu. Du.) it may be a corruption of הֲרָמוֹת, *pyramids* (cf. Arab. *hirâm*, a pyramid, which *may* be of Egypt. origin): the allusion, in this case, will be to the pyramids built for themselves as mausoleums by the kings of Egypt. "Palaces" would be mentioned, like the gold and silver of v.[15], as an indication of the earthly greatness of those with whom Job would then be: "pyramids" would, in addition, suggest impressively the placid sleep of those who lay buried in them.

16. Or (attaching to [13]), like one prematurely born, put away at once out of sight, or ([16b]) like a stillborn child, he would have had no existence at all: if he had not been with the famous dead, he would, at least, have been equally removed from life and its troubles.—*An untimely birth*] נֵפֶל (𝔊 ἔκτρωμα, as 1 Cor. 15^{8}), as Ps. 58^{9}, Qoh. 6^{3} †.

17–19. He dwells on the thought of the peacefulness of Sheol,—a peacefulness shared in by all alike.

17. *Raging*] the Heb. is a *subst.*, and cannot have the transitive sense of *troubling* (EVV.). The idea of רגז is *strong agitation*; the vb. רָגַז is lit. to *shake* (intrans.) *violently*, as mountains, Is. 5^{25}; then fig., of different strong emotions, usually of terror (Ex. 15^{14}, Dt. 2^{25}, Is. 32^{10}), but also of wrath (Is. 28^{21}, Pr. 29^{9}), surprise (Is. 14^{9}), violent grief (2 S. 19^{1}).

18 (There) the captives are at ease together;
They hear not the voice of the taskmaster.
19 The small and great are there;
And the servant is free from his master.

20 Why doth he give light to him that is in travail,
And life unto the bitter in soul;

So רֹגֶז, *agitation* (though it cannot always be rendered in English by the same word), is used in 37^2 of the rolling of thunder, Hab. 3^2 of wrath, in ch. 3^{26} of a tumult of feeling, 14^1 (cf. Is. 14^3) of the unrest of life, here of the turbulence of passion (cf. for the unrest of the wicked, Is. 57^{20}). The "troubling" of others may be a consequence of this; but it is not itself the idea which רֹגֶז expresses.

18. *Captives*] As ^{b} shows, captives employed in forced labour, like the Israelites in Egypt. EVV. *prisoners*; but this so much suggests persons who are imprisoned, that it is here misleading and unsuitable. The Heb. (lit. *the bound*) is not limited to persons imprisoned, but is used in the broader sense of those confined in captivity (Ps. 69^{34} 102^{21}).—*The voice of the taskmaster*] (Ex. 3^7 $5^{6.10.13.14}$), urging them to their work with shouts and curses. The word means properly the *hard-presser* (Is. 3^{12} 9^3 $14^{2.4}$; in the exaction of money, Dt. $15^{2.3}$, 2 K. 23^{35}).

20–26. Why does God prolong life to those who in general ($^{20-22}$), and like Job in particular ($^{23-26}$), in their misery, long only for death?

20. *Doth he give*] or, is given (see phil. n.). He does not name, though he alludes to God; and the indirect reference, though partly due to reverence, betrays a rising alienation in his heart (Da.). He hints in ^{23} that he owes his calamity to God; but it is only after Eliphaz's rebuke (c. 5) that he says it outright (6^4).—*Him that is in travail*] Lit. *one labouring, toiling*; cognate to the word rendered *travail* in ^{10}.—*Bitter in soul*], *i.e.* soured, disappointed, aggrieved. The combination (with adj., verb, or subst.) is frequent: Jg. 18^{25}, 1 S. 1^{10} 22^2 30^6, 2 S. 17^8 (as a bear robbed of its cubs).

21. *Search*] Lit. *dig* (Ex. 7^{24}); but 11^{18} 39^{29} show that the

21 Who long for death, but it cometh not;
And search for it more than for hid treasures;
22 Who are glad unto exultation,
And rejoice, when they find the grave?
23 Unto a man whose way is hid,
And whom God hath hedged in?
24 For instead of (?) my bread my sighing cometh,
And my roarings are poured out like water.
25 For I fear a fear, and it cometh upon me,
And that which I dread cometh unto me.

---

word may be used without any thought of its lit. meaning: cf. Pr. 2^4 (וכמטמונים תחפשׂנה). It is, however, specially apposite here, as מטמנים (from √ טמן, "to hide") were often "hidden" in the earth (Jer. 41^8 כי יש לנו מטמנים בשדה חטים וג׳, Jos. 7^{21} טמֻנים בארץ).

23. *A man*, etc.] Job's way is "hid," so that he cannot see in which direction to turn, and "hedged in," so that he knows no way of escape from the difficulties in which he finds himself. The reference is not, perhaps, merely to his physical sufferings, but also to the mental distress occasioned by them: the sense that the calamities which have befallen him are undeserved, the difficulty of reconciling them with his belief in the justice of God,—these form a riddle which he cannot solve, and place him in a situation of dire perplexity, from which he can find no outlet (cf. $19^{6ff.}$).—*Hedged in*] (virtually) the word used by the Satan in 1^{10} in a different sense: there of the protection which God had thrown around Job, here of the mental embarrassment which His treatment of him had occasioned. Cf. for the figure, Hos. 2^8, c. 19^8, La. 3^7.

24. *Instead of* (?) *my bread*] the rendering is doubtful (see phil. n.). For the thought, cf. Ps. $42^{4\,(3)}$ $80^{6\,(5)}$.—*Cometh*] Cometh constantly or regularly: the sense of the Heb. impf.—*My roarings*] Properly, the *roaring* of a lion (4^{10}); then fig. of loud groanings or complaints; so Ps. 22^2 32^3; cf. 38^9.—*As water*] In a continuous stream.

25. *I fear a fear*] he has but to imagine some direful misfortune, and it comes upon him.

26 I have no ease, and no quiet,
And no rest; and (yet) torment cometh.

IV. 1 And Eliphaz the Temanite answered, and said,

---

26. His hopeless monotony of unrest. He has no time to breathe (9^{18}), no time to recover from one thought of agony or despair before another overwhelms him.—*Torment*] the strong word (רֹגֶז) explained on ^{17}. Here it denotes the vehement tumult of feeling—sense of injustice and desertion by God, despair, alarm (cf. 7^{11-14})—produced, directly or indirectly, by his disease. Cf. the לֵב רַגָּז, or "agitated heart," which Israel, in its anxiety for its life, its restlessness, its constant fear, is to have when in exile (Dt. 28^{65}, cf. $^{66-67}$).

IV. V. Eliphaz's first speech.—Silent a whole week through, while Job was silent (2^{13}), the friends are driven into speech by his words; partly from their concern for God, for Job's words, though not directly and by name accusing God, must have seemed to border on blasphemy, so that God needed to be defended ($13^{7f.}$ 42^{7}); partly from their concern for Job, lest his attitude under trial (4^{5}) should annul the merit of a life of piety (4^{6}), and prevent that restoration to happiness which must certainly follow a humble acceptance of present calamity (5^{8-27}). Eliphaz is the first of the friends to speak, probably because he was the eldest of them (cp. 15^{10}, if this is a covert allusion to Eliphaz's own age, and 32^{6}, where Elihu explains that, as the youngest, he had kept silence to the last), or, perhaps, because he was the most eminent (cp. 29^{8}) of them. He begins with a word of apology (4^{2}), and of surprise that Job, who has so often comforted others in their adversity, should, in his own trouble, abandon himself to despair ($^{3-5}$). Then, so far from making an immediate attack upon Job, he recalls Job's former perfect life; and to enforce the point that this should even now give him hope and confidence (^{6}), he utters some general truths: the righteous man never *perished* under affliction (^{7}): it is the wicked who receive the reward of their deeds ($^{8-11}$): above all, he had learnt by a mysterious revelation that no man is righteous before God ($^{12-21}$). He now turns to Job,

[2] If one attempt a word with thee, wilt thou be impatient?
But to restrain words, who is able?

---

advising him to apply these truths to himself. Resentment against God only incurs disaster (5^{1-7}). In Job's place he would betake himself to God ([8]), whose government of the world is wonderful and good ([9-16]), and whose chastisements are designed only to lead to ultimate blessing ([17-26]): let Job take heed ([27]).

In this first speech, Eliphaz, for the most part, applies his theory of life and of God's dealings to Job's case with consideration and tenderness; yet, in 4^5, he is rather "joining words together against Job" than placing himself in Job's place (16^4), so as to be able to do for Job, in this greater distress, what Job had been wont to do to others; Job used to speak to those in danger of despair, but not, like Eliphaz in [5], merely to tell them what poltroons they were; and to the bereaved ($29^{12f.}$), but not merely, as Eliphaz in 5^{25}, almost oblivious of the poignancy of the sudden loss of children, to speak conventionally of others yet to be.

2. Eliphaz begins with a question, as also in 15^2 22^2; and so Bildad in 8^2 18^1, Ṣophar in 11^1; indeed, the only speeches of the friends not opening with a question are Ṣophar's second (20^2) and Bildad's (mutilated) third (25^2) speech.—*If one attempt*, etc.] for an alternative translation of 𝔐, see phil. n. It is doubtful whether 𝔊, on which Be.[K] is inclined to base a variant, is more than a paraphrase of 𝔐. [a] is overlong in 𝔐, but also in 𝔊; it may originally have been shorter and more closely parallel to [b].—*Impatient*] Heb. *wearied*. "Grieved" in EVV. is an archaism for *troubled* or *harassed*: and "commune" is an archaism for "speak."

3, 4. The second lines of each v. are complete parallels to one another, and, if united, would give a distich of the type a. b. c | a′. b′. c′; with slight variations they actually do occur elsewhere (Is. 35^3), so united in a distich of the form a. b. c | b′. c′. a′ (cp. *Forms of Hebrew Poetry*, p. 66 f.). In spite of this, it is unnecessary and even inadvisable to transpose [3b] and [4a]; the parallelism of [3a] with [3b] and [4a] with [4b], though incomplete, is entirely normal (*Forms*, pp. 59 f., 72 ff.).

3 Behold, thou hast instructed many,
And slack hands thou hast been wont to strengthen.
4 Him that was stumbling, thy words would raise up,
And bowing knees thou wouldst confirm.
5 Because now it cometh unto thee, and thou art impatient,
It reacheth unto thee, and thou art dismayed.

6 Is not thy fear (of God) thy confidence,
⌜And⌝ thy hope the perfectness of thy ways?

---

3. *Instructed*] *i.e.* according to the proper meaning of יסר, "instructed *morally*" (see Dr. on Dt. 4[36]), teaching them, for instance, to view their afflictions as a father's chastening, and as having a moral purpose.—*Slack*] or, *hanging down*, a sign of helplesness and despondency.

4. *Him that was stumbling* and *the bowing knees* are both figures for those unable to bear up under the weight of affliction; cp. Is. 35[3] (of the despondent Israelites in exile).

5. *Because*] gives the reason why Eliphaz speaks as he has done in [2] (*Lex.* 474*a*); at the first taste of trouble, so it seems to Eliphaz the onlooker, Job has broken down entirely, losing patience and self-possession. With this reason for venturing to speak, the apologetic introduction to the speech is at an end; the speech proper, which Eliphaz feels compelled to address to Job, begins with [6].

6. Having briefly and rather indirectly expressed his surprise at, and disapprobation of, Job's words and present temper ([2. 5]), Eliphaz starts the main argument of his speech with a recognition of Job's character as reflected in his life before trouble came; he admits that Job had been perfect (see on 1[1]), and his life regulated by "fear" (יראה, which Eliphaz (15[4] 22[4]), but he only, uses absolutely in the sense of the more usual phrase, "fear of God"; cp. the adj. in 1[1]). This being so, Job ought not to have lost confidence and hope; since, however, as his words had shown, he had done so for the moment at least, Eliphaz proceeds, in the light of his own observation of life ([8]), to show ([7. 8]) why a "perfect" man has no need to despair even if affliction comes to him.

7 Remember, I pray thee, who (ever) perished, being innocent?
Or where were the upright cut off?
8 According as I have seen, they that plow naughtiness,
And they that sow trouble, reap it.
9 By the breath of God they perish,
And by the blast of his anger are they consumed.

7–9. No *righteous* man ever perished under affliction; if the righteous suffer, their afflictions are disciplinary only, and not intended for their destruction. It is the wicked who, if they fall into misfortune, are reaping the fruits of their own misdeeds. Eliphaz's theodicy is that of the old-fashioned school represented by the author of Ps. 37. It is not very tactfully expressed, however: Job's longing was to find release from misery by death: it is the reward of the righteous, Eliphaz begins, that they do not die (*i.e.* before completing the full tale of life).

8. *Naughtiness*] *'Āwen* seems to denote properly what is *empty*, *disappointing*, *valueless*; and it is used in different senses, according to the context. Thus it denotes (*a*) *calamity*, *misfortune*, Am. 5^{5}, Bethel shall come to *misfortune* (יהיה לְאָוֶן); Pr. 12^{21} no *calamity* (אָוֶן) will happen to the righteous; 22^{8} He that soweth unrighteousness reapeth *misfortune*; (*b*), as here, *naught*-y conduct, *naughtiness*, a term of disparagement for wickedness, as Mic. 2^{1} Ah, they that devise *naughtiness*, and work evil upon their beds; Ps. 7^{15} 10^{7} $36^{4.5}$ etc., and often in the expression פֹּעֲלֵי אָוֶן, Ps. $5^{6(5)}$ etc.; (*c*) a *thing of nought*, especially an *idol*, Is. 66^{3} He that burneth incense is as (= no better than) he that blesseth a *thing of nought* (an idol), Zec. 10^{2}. For the figures, expressing significantly how the consequence follows inevitably from the action, cf. Hos. 8^{7} 10^{13} and Pr. 22^{8}.—*Trouble*] עָמָל, the word explained on 3^{10}. The meaning of the verse is thus that those who "plow," *'āwen*, in the form of "naughtiness," will reap it in the form of "misfortune," and that those who "sow," ʿāmāl, or "travail," for others will reap it in its consequences themselves.

9. The verse describes what the "harvest" implied in ^{8b} is. The underlying figure is that of herbage, withered and burned

10 The roaring of the lion, and the voice of the loud lion,
And the teeth of the young lions are dashed out.
11 The stout lion perisheth for lack of prey,
And the whelps of the lioness are scattered abroad.

12 But to me was a word brought stealthily,
And mine ear received a whisper from it.

---

up by a hot blast blowing up from the desert, with which Yahweh's breath is implicitly compared. Cf. Hos. 13^{15} ("the sirocco shall come, *the breath* [or *wind*] *of Yahweh*, coming up from the wilderness, and his spring shall become dry, and his fountain shall be dried up"), Is. 40^{7}.

10–11. Another graphic figure describing the sudden destruction of the wicked: the breaking-up and dispersion of a den of lions: the lions, powerful and terrible as they were, have their strength broken by a sudden blow; the old lion perishes for lack of food, and the cubs are dispersed. Cf. 5^{2-5}, where the actual breaking-up of the home of the wicked is described. The sudden blow is described in ^{10} by the perf. tense; the ptcp. and impf. in ^{11} describe what then follows. *Are dashed out* (same word as Ps. 58^{7}) belongs properly only to *teeth*; *roaring* and *voice* are connected with it by zeugma.

12–21. Let Job remember that no man can be pure before God. Eliphaz has insisted that no righteous man *perishes* in his afflictions; but the question still remains, What is the cause of Job's afflictions? This, he proceeds to impress upon Job, was not anything peculiar to Job himself: it was the general imperfection of all created beings, which Job shares not only with other men, but even with angels, the highest and purest of God's creatures. This truth he places before Job with delicacy and consideration: it had been impressed upon him by a voice from heaven, coming in the still hours of night: Job might not have had such an experience: Eliphaz thus at once excuses Job, and also instructs him.

12. *To me*] The words are emphatic: they contrast what was revealed to Eliphaz personally (cp. 15^{11} 22^{22}) with what Job and other persons might have learnt from ordinary experi-

13 Amid thoughts (arising) out of visions of the night,
When deep sleep falleth on men,
14 Fear came upon me, and trembling,
And filled my bones with dread.

---

ence.—*A whisper from it*] "His ear caught it all, but the whole of it was but a whisper" (Da.).

13–16. How the truth was borne in upon him which he desires to impress upon Job. It was in the dead of night, when all around were in deep sleep. His mind was agitated by perplexing thoughts arising out of visions of the night. Suddenly a great terror fell upon him; and he was conscious of a breath, or cold wind, passing before him. Then he seemed to perceive a figure standing before him, too dim, however, to be discerned distinctly, from which came forth a still voice, which said, Can a mortal be just before God, or can a man be pure before his Maker?

13. *Thoughts*] The word (שְׂעִפִּים, 20^{2}†; cf. שַׂרְעַפִּים, Ps. 94^{19} 139^{23}†) seems to denote *divided* (cf. *μεριμνηρίζω*), tangled, perplexing thoughts.—*Deep sleep*] 33^{15}, Gn. 2^{21} 15^{12}, 1 S. 26^{12}, Pr. 19^{15}.

14b. Lit. *made the multitude of my bones to fear, i.e.* my bones, as many as they are: as we should say, *my whole frame.* The *bones*, as the supporting framework of the body, are often in Heb. poetry taken as representing it; and affections, and even emotions, pervading or affecting strongly a man's being, are poetically attributed to them, or conceived as operating in them. See, for instance, Pr. 3^{8} (wisdom, *moisture* to thy bones), 12^{4} (a bad wife, *rottenness* in the bones), 15^{30} (שמועה טובה תדשן עצם), 17^{22} (רוח נכאה תיבש גרם); in prosperity they "sprout," Is. 66^{14} (ועצמותיכם כדשא תפרחנה); in sickness or trouble they are parched up, Jb. 30^{30}, Ps. 102^{4} (עצמותי כמוקד נחרו), cf. Lam. 1^{13} (שלח אש בעצמותי), or shrivelled, Ps. $31^{11\,(10)}$ (ועצמי עששו), or wear away, 32^{3} (בלו עצמי); in great fear "rottenness" enters into them (Hab. 3^{16}); in deep emotion they are dismayed, Ps. $6^{3\,(2)}$ (נבהלו עצמי), or rejoice, $51^{10\,(8)}$ (תגלנה עצמות דכית), and Ps. 35^{10} in the praise of God they even "speak." And so here they "fear" (not "quake," EVV.).

15 And a breath passed before my face;
The hair of my flesh bristled up.
16 It stood still, but I discerned not its appearance;
(It was) a form before mine eyes:
I heard a still voice (saying),
17 "Can a mortal be just before God?
Or can a man be pure before his Maker?

15–16. Notice the graphic imperfects.

15. *A breath*] An uncanny breath, or cold air, the symbol of a presence which he could not discern, seemed to pass over him. רוח, "spirit," does not occur in the OT. in the sense of an apparition (EVV.).

16. *It* (1)] the mysterious object in his presence.—*A form*] Heb. תמונה denoting here a form, the presence of which could be felt, though its appearance or contour could not be distinctly descried: cf. of the intangible, yet quasi-sensual, manifestation of Yahweh which was vouchsafed to Moses (Nu. 12^{8}), and to which the Psalmist aspires to be admitted (Ps. $17^{15(14)}$); and see Dr. on Dt. 4^{12}.—*A still voice*] Lit. *stillness and a voice*—a hendiadys = *a still low voice.* Cf. 1 K. 19^{12} קול דממה דקה, "*the sound* (or *a voice*) *of thin stillness*" = "*a* still, small voice."

17–21. The contents of the revelation. V.[17] states the revelation itself; [18–21] gives the proof of it. With [17–19] compare 15^{14-16} (Eliphaz), 25^{4-6} (Bildad), where the argument and largely also the expressions are similar.

17. *Just before God*] see phil. n. The grammatically possible alternative rendering "more just than God" (EV.) is unsuitable, and whatever may be the case in 32^{2} (Elihu) was not intended here, as [18] shows. *Before God* and *before his Maker* are emphatic: men might judge a man just and pure, not so God, who finds even angels imperfect, and, *a fortiori*, men. For Job's attitude to the subject of this revelation, see 9^{2}. It is noticeable that Eliphaz even here rather implies an identification of omnipotence and absolute moral purity; God is omnipotent and all-just ([17]); the angels, as His servants, are inferior to Him in power and in liability to error ([18]); men subject to the frailties of the body and the transitoriness of

18 "Behold, in his servants he putteth no trust;
And his angels he chargeth with error:
19 How much more them that dwell in houses of clay,
Whose foundation is in the dust.
They are crushed before the moth;
20 Betwixt morning and evening they are beaten to pieces.
Without any heeding, they perish for ever.
21 If their (tent-) cord is plucked up within them,
Do they not die, and that without wisdom?"

---

human life are by far inferior to the angels in power, and in moral standing before God ([19]).

18. *His servants*] *i.e.* (cp. [b]) His heavenly attendants.—*Error*] or, changing a letter, *folly*: see phil. n.

19. *Houses of clay*] bodies made of clay (cp. 10[9] 33[6]), or dust (Gn. 2[7] 3[19], 1 Cor. 15[47] ἐκ γῆς, χοϊκός). For the fig. "houses," cp. 2 Cor. 5[1] ἡ ἐπίγειος ἡμῶν οἰκία τοῦ σκήνους: Wis. 9[5] τὸ γεῶδες σκῆνος: 2 P. 1[14] ἡ ἀπόθεσις τοῦ σκηνώματός μου.—*Whose foundations*, etc.] their very foundation is of the earth; they are derived from earth, and limited to earth. And that being so, they are the more fragile and destructible. For "foundations" as a figure for the "conditions of existence" (Bu.), cp. 22[16] (Eliphaz) and Pr. 10[25].

19c, 20a. These lines are obvious parallels (cp. *Forms*, 70; cp. 66 f.) forming together a distich, which expresses the frailty and, hyperbolically, the brevity of human life: man is the creature of a day, dying more quickly and easily than such a fragile insect as the moth ([19c]; cp. Is. 51[6]), born in the morning and dead before nightfall ([20a]; cp. Is. 38[12], Ps. 90[5f.]). The verbs, expressing man's destruction, appear to be chosen with reference to the clay houses of their bodies ([19]); it is true that the first (ידכאום) is elsewhere used metaphorically (*Lex.*), but here it seems to be literal: they are *crushed* or pulverized back into the fine dust (דכא, Ps. 90[3]) from which they were made (Gn. 3[19], Qoh. 12[7]), *beaten to pieces* or reduced to fragments (יכתו: of a potter's vessel, Is. 30[14]).

20b, 21. Scarcely a tristich; but whether apparently so, or an isolated stichos and distich, the form is suspicious and the

V. 1 Call now; is there any that will answer thee?
And to which of the holy ones wilt thou turn?

---

text contains some questionable features (see phil. n.).—*Without any heeding*] if the text is correct, this should mean: so insignificant are they no one notices them, or cares for their ate.

21. If the text is correct, the end of life is compared to the collapse of a tent as soon as the cord holding it in its place is plucked up; if the figure be pressed, the body will correspond to the tent (cp. Is. 38^{12} "my habitation (דוֹר)—fig. for *my body* —is *plucked up*, and carried away from me like a shepherd's tent"), and the life to the cord. The v. emphasises the quickness and completeness of man's end. Elsewhere the end of life is represented by the figure of cutting off a thread (6^9, Is. 38^{12b}), or cutting the cord which suspends a lamp (Qoh. 12^6). —*And that without wisdom*] Eliphaz has pointed out the physical imperfections of human nature; here he reverts to the point ($^{17-19a}$) which the thought of these is intended to lead up to, viz. its *moral* imperfection; men die without having attained wisdom, *i.e.* without having realized the moral limitations of human nature, without having perceived—as Job, for instance, has not perceived—that no man (^{17}) can be morally perfect.

V. 1–7. Since no man can be just before God, it is only the foolish who resent God's dealings with them, and, in consequence, bring upon themselves disaster.

1. *Call now, is there any,* etc.] "The imperative is not ironical, but merely a very animated way of putting a supposition: if thou appeal then against God, is there any that will hear thee or aid thee?" (Da.).—*Holy ones*] *angels*: so 15^{15} (Eliphaz); also Zec. 14^5, Ps. $89^{6.8}$, Dn. $4^{10.14.20}$ 8^{13}, Ecclus. 42^{17}, En. 1^9 (and very often: see Charles, n. *ad loc.*). The heavenly beings are so termed, not on account of moral perfection (ct. 4^{18}), but of their proximity to God. The v. appears to indicate that the writer was familiar with the custom of seeking the intercession of angels (cp., perhaps, 33^{23}, Elihu). The germ of this custom, though not the custom itself, may be found in

[2] (Nay); for it is the foolish man, whom vexation killeth,
And the silly one whom jealousy slayeth.

Zec. 1^{12}, where the angel of Yahweh, voluntarily and unsought by man, intercedes with God on behalf of Jerusalem. Later, Raphael is represented as bringing the "memorial of the prayer" of Tobit and Sara before God (Tob. 12^{12}), and (Tob. 12^{15} 𝔊^{BA}) as one of the seven angels who present the prayers of the saints; "the holy ones of heaven" are besought by the souls of the righteous dead to bring their cause before God (En. $9^{3.10}$); and in En. 15^2 it is implied that angels are the natural intercessors for men: see, further, on this doctrine between 200 B.C. and 100 A.D., Charles's n. on Test. Levi 3^5. Though the doctrine of angelic intercession found here is different from, and presumably a later development than, that of Zec. 1^{12} (518 B.C.), and finds no clear and exact parallel earlier than Enoch (2nd cent. B.C.), it is scarcely necessary on this ground to treat the v. as a marginal comment on 4^{18} that subsequently found its place here (Du.); and if the connection between 4^{21} and 5^1 is not altogether obvious, neither would that between 4^{21} and 5^2 be closer (see Peake's criticism of Du.); for, as Bu. and Peake point out, 4^{21} speaks of the common lot of frail man; $5^{2ff.}$ of the destruction of fools in particular. And, again, 5^1 may stand related to 5^8: let not Job appeal to the angels, thereby manifesting the irritation of the foolish; but let him turn in the right temper to God Himself.

2. Since no man can be just before God, it is foolish, and indeed fatal, to cherish vexation or resentment at misfortune.—*Vexation*] כַּעַשׂ (כַּעַס) means always the feeling of chagrin aroused by treatment regarded (rightly or wrongly) as unmerited. Only the foolish man displays it under misfortune. Cf. especially Pr. 12^{16} "As for the fool, his *vexation* is made known presently."—*Killeth* ‖ *slayeth*] viz., by causing them to murmur at their lot, and so bring upon themselves further calamities.—*The silly one*] פתה: cp. יונה פתה, a *silly* dove, Hos. 7^{11}. The term is akin to the more frequent פתי, the simple, credulous (Pr. 14^{15}) man; see Toy on Pr. 14^{15}.—*Jealousy*] קנאה is parallel to כעשׂ, *vexation*, as are the corresponding vbs. in Dt. $32^{16.21}$. The word is here

3 *I* have seen the foolish taking root;
  But his habitation ⌜was cursed⌝ suddenly.
4 Far now are his children from safety,
  And they are crushed in the gate with none to deliver them.

---

almost equal to *passion, passionate anger*: cp. Pr. 14^{30}, Is. 42^{13} (a warrior's passion).

3–5. Eliphaz cites an instance from his own experience (see 4^{8}) confirming the truth stated in ^{2}: he saw a "foolish" man prospering for a time, but suddenly overtaken by misfortune.—*Taking root*] The fig. is that of a tree, which is common in Job ($8^{16f.}$ 14^{7-9} 15^{32} 18^{16} 19^{10} 24^{20} 29^{19}).—*Was cursed*, etc.] 𝔐 *I cursed*; his habitation having been ruined, I suddenly cursed it as the abode of one who had been a sinner (cf. Ps. $37^{35f.}$ I passed by it, and, lo, it was gone, etc.). But "suddenly" goes badly with "I cursed": what we expect is a verb, stating directly what happened to the habitation, as, *e.g.*, that the curse of God fell on it: others, emending differently, render "was worm-eaten," or "was emptied out," or "was laid waste" (see phil. n.).—*Habitation* (נָוֶה)] properly a pastoral term, meaning a *homestead*, or *abode of shepherds and flocks* (Is. 65^{10}, Jer. 23^{3}), but often used in poetry of a habitation in general (as Pr. 3^{33}, Is. 33^{20}).

4. The effects of the disaster upon his family: deprived of their protector, his children are helpless, and cannot get their just rights. In the mention of the fate of the foolish man's house and family, there is an indirect glance at what has happened to Job himself (1^{14-19}). The "gate" (or rather "gateway,"—a passage of some length with seats on both sides) of an Eastern city was the place where justice was often administered; see, *e.g.*, c. 31^{21}, Dt. 25^{7}, Am. 5^{10}, Is. 29^{21}, Ps. 127^{5} (where a man with a number of stalwart sons to support him can "speak" successfully "with his enemies in the gate"). With *are crushed*, comp. Pr. 22^{22} "Rob not the poor because he is poor; and *crush not* the afflicted *in the gate*." On this *v.* Wetzstein remarks (*ap.* Del.[2] p. 84), "What a Semite dreads more than anything is the desolation of his family, so that its

[5] That which ⌈they have reaped⌉ the hungry eateth,
And ⌈their sheaf the poor taketh⌉ (?),
And ⌈the thirsty draweth from their well⌉ (?).
[6] For affliction cometh not forth from the dust,
Neither doth travail spring out of the ground;

---

members all perish or come to misery, his home is laid waste, and its ruins become a proverb for future generations." This feeling is particularly strong among the Bedawin, although naturally in their case there can be no question of the traces left by their hair-tents.

5. The fate of the foolish man's possessions: with none to protect them, his crops become the prey of the hungry Bedawi plunderer. Literally rendered, 𝕳 reads: whose (sing.) harvest the hungry eateth, and unto from (*sic*) thorns he taketh it, and the snare is eager for their substance. Some of this is impossible, more improbable (see phil. n.). Alternative emendations of [c] give: And the thirsty drinketh their milk (or, their wine). If, as is probable, "thirsty" is correctly restored in [c], [b] which would then separate the more immediate parallels "hungry" and "thirsty" may well be intrusive and responsible for an original distich becoming a tristich.

6–7. Eliphaz justifies ("For") his position, that it is foolish to complain of misfortune, by the principle that travail (3^{10} n.) and affliction (און, 4^{8} n.) do not spring out of the earth like weeds, are not something external to man, which might come upon him undeservedly, but result from causes inherent in human nature: Job ought not, therefore, to be surprised if he has to experience them. Eliphaz, as before (4^{17-19}), seeks to make it easy for Job to reconcile himself to his position, by showing him that his case is no exceptional one, but merely the exemplification of a general law: there is nothing strange in his suffering affliction; for it is natural to man so to do.

6. *Cometh forth*] of vegetable growth, as 14^{2} 31^{40}, Dt. 14^{22}, Is. 11^{1}.—*The dust*] the soil: so 8^{19} (n.). "The dust" and "the ground," like "the dust" and "the earth" in 14^{8}, and like the vbs. in both lines, here simply belong to the fig. of vegetable growth: and it is a mistake, therefore, to detect in

7 But man is born unto travail,
As sparks fly upwards.

"from the dust" an implied contrast to "from on high" (Peake).—*Spring out*] צמח is used regularly of trees, vegetation, etc., growing up from the ground: cp. Gn. 2^5 41^6.

7. *Is born unto trouble*, etc.] "It is as natural for man to experience misfortune as it is for sparks (see phil. n.) to fly upwards. If pressed, Eliphaz would have said that man did not merely fall into misfortune, but brought misfortune upon himself by following the impulses of his evil nature; but in his first speech he keeps the question of Job's sin in the background, and alludes to it as lightly and indirectly as possible" (Dr.). This interpretation (see also on $^{6.7}$: and cp. Di. al.) has appeared to some to labour under difficulties either in itself, or as an interpretation of an original part of Eliphaz's speech. To avoid what appears to them inconsistency with other parts of Eliphaz's speech, We. (*Jahrb. f. deutsche Theologie*, xvi. 557), Sgf. Be. Du. om. vv.$^{6.7}$. Bu. finds the sense almost identical with that of 4^8—that man is actively responsible for his own misfortune; and, pointing the vb. in ^{7a} as a Hif., renders: But man begets travail. Du. urges that ^{6} is pointless, since Job has not urged the contrary, and, taken affirmatively, inconsistent with Eliphaz's position in $4^{19ff.}$; nor is it probable that ^{6} should be taken interrogatively: torn, as they are, from their context the vv. remain obscure. Peake, not perhaps without reason, questions whether "not from the dust" in ^{6} really means not without a cause, and hazards the suggestion that ^{6} may originally have affirmed what it now denies (cp. Richter, who proposes הלא for כי לא), and that the meaning was: man is doomed to travail by the conditions of his earthly life, but (v.^{7b}) the angels escape, since they soar high above the earth. But the assumption that "sons of flame" mean not "sparks" but "angels" (𝔗 *demons*), is precarious.

8–16. Were Eliphaz in Job's place, he would betake himself to God, who in His rule of the world is guided uniformly by purposes of good ($^{10-16}$), and who, even when He sends chastisements, designs them as a blessing ($^{17-27}$).

8 But as for me, I would seek unto God,
And unto God would I lay out my cause:
9 Who doeth great things and unsearchable,
Marvellous things without number:
10 Who giveth rain upon the earth,
And sendeth waters upon the fields:
11 ⌈ Who [1] setteth up on high those that be low;
And they which mourn are exalted to safety.

---

8. *But*] In the Heb. a strong adversative (2^5), marking a contrast with the behaviour described in $^{1.2}$.—*Seek unto God*] as an inquirer (Is. 8^{19} 11^{10} al.), asking humbly for help and guidance.

9–16. A description of the wonderful power and operation of God, intended to show *why* Job should lay his case before Him. God is wonderful in power and goodness, both generally (^{9}), and in particular in fertilizing the thirsty earth (^{10}), and in adjusting the many inequalities of society, in encouraging and lifting up those that are abased, and in defeating the malicious devices of the crafty, and rescuing the needy from their clutches ($^{11-16}$).

9. Cf. 9^{10} (almost the same words).

10. An example at once of God's power and of His benevolence: He supplies the thirsty earth with rain and streams of water. Cf. Ps. 147^8; and (for ^{b}) 104^{11}.

11–16. In the moral sphere, God's providence acts by raising up and helping the lowly and the mourners, and by rescuing the poor from the devices of the crafty.

11a. Cf. 1 S. 2^8, Ps. $113^{7f.}$. He secures the mourner against the avarice of hard-hearted oppressors: cf. 2 K. 4^1. The Heb. word (קדר) does not denote a state of mind (sorrowing or grieving), but (meaning properly *to be dirty*) has reference to the squalid person and dark attire (head sprinkled with ashes, sackcloth, etc.) of a mourner in the East: cf. 2 S. 13^{19}, Est. 4^1.

12 f. He frustrates the malicious devices of the crafty, who scheme, for instance, to benefit themselves at the expense of the innocent or the poor (cf. Mic. 3^{1-3} 7^3, Is. 32^7 etc.).

12 Who frustrateth the devices of the crafty,
So that their hands cannot carry out sound counsel.
13 Who taketh the wise in their own craftiness;
And the counsel of the tortuous is carried headlong.
14 In the daytime they meet with darkness,
And as in the night they grope at noonday.
15 But he saveth ⌜the fatherless⌝ from their sword,
And the needy from the hand of the mighty.

---

12. *Frustrate*] cf. Ps. 33^{10a}, Is. 44^{25}.—*Carry out sound counsel*] or, perhaps, *achieve success*: see phil. n.

13. *Taketh*] as in a net or trap, Am. $3^{4.5}$, Ps. 35^{8} (the same word).—*In their own craftiness*] It becomes the means by which they are themselves ruined (cf. Ps. 7^{15} $57^{7\,(6)}$, Pr. 26^{27} 28^{10}).—*The tortuous*] *i.e.* men who pursue tortuous or crooked ways to attain their ends. Cf. Pr. 8^{8} "there is nothing tortuous or crooked in them" (אין בהם נִפְתָּל וְעִקֵּשׁ); Ps. 18^{27} "With the crooked thou showest thyself tortuous" (עִם עִקֵּשׁ תִּתְפַּתָּל); Dt. 32^{5} דּוֹר עִקֵּשׁ וּפְתַלְתֹּל.—*Is carried headlong*] Lit. *hastened* (unduly), *i.e.* precipitated before it is ripe, and so frustrated. 13a is the only passage of Job quoted in the NT. (1 Cor. 3^{19} *ὁ δρασσόμενος τοὺς σοφοὺς ἐν τῇ πανουργίᾳ αὐτῶν*). 𝔊 has *ὁ καταλαμβάνων σοφοὺς ἐν φρονήσει* (*A* + *αὐτῶν*): St. Paul must, therefore, have either translated himself from the Hebrew or used some version of the OT. other than 𝔊. For the implicit criticism of "the wise," cp. 37^{24}.

14. The perplexity and bewilderment of those whom God thus thwarts. They are like blind people groping about in the bright day.. For the thought, cf. $12^{24f.}$, Is. $19^{13f.}$; for the figure, 12^{25a}, Dt. 28^{29}, Is. 59^{10}.

15 f. And so the poor, whose ruin these "crafty" ones had been contriving, are delivered from their clutches, and evil, abashed, is obliged to stop her mouth.

15. Lit. 𝔐 reads: "So he saveth from the sword from their mouth, And from the hand of the mighty the needy." The imperfectly balanced parallelism shows that there must be some error in the text. The error cannot be certainly corrected (see phil. n.); but the general sense is clear.

16 So the poor hath hope,
And unrighteousness stoppeth her mouth.
17 Behold, happy is the man whom God correcteth:
And despise thou not the chastening of the Almighty.
18 For *he* maketh sore, and bindeth up;
He woundeth, and his hands heal
19 In six troubles he will deliver thee;
And in seven no evil will touch thee.

16b. Cp. Ps. 107^{42b} וכל־עולה קפצה פיה. These verses place before us a strange picture of the social customs of the time. But the prophets and the Psalms fully corroborate it. Then, as now, in the East, men of any wealth or position, landowners, government officials, tradesmen, money-lenders, etc., leave no stone unturned to aggrandize themselves at the expense of the defenceless and the unfortunate.

17–26. And so there is a purpose in Job's afflictions: they are designed to end in more abundant blessing; and Eliphaz draws an idyllic and engaging picture of the happiness awaiting Job, if he will but receive God's chastisement aright. The passage is a beautiful and striking one, admirably adapted to move one differently circumstanced from Job to penitence and submission. But Job has *not* sinned; and, naturally, Eliphaz's argument makes no impression upon him.

17. Eliphaz begins by applying to Job the maxim of Pr. $3^{11.12}$ (quoted Heb. $12^{5.6}$), "*Despise not*, my son, *the chastening of* Yahweh, and spurn not His reproof; for whom Yahweh loveth He *correcteth*; and (treateth) as a father (or, with 𝔊 (cf. ^{18a} here), *and maketh sore*, or *paineth*) the son in whom He delighteth."

18. For He does not make sore only, He also heals. "God's drastic surgery is for the sufferer's higher good, and the hand that uses the knife without flinching is also the gentle hand that tenderly binds up the wound" (Pe.). Cf. Hos. 6^1, Dt. 32^{39}; also Is. 30^{26b}.

19 ff. An eloqent enumeration of the blessings which Job may expect, if he but follows Eliphaz's advice.

19. Out of all troubles and dangers, however numerous they may be, he will be delivered.—*Six* . . . *seven*] is an

20 In famine he will redeem thee from death;
And in war from the power of the sword.
21 ⌈From⌉ the scourge of the tongue thou shalt be hid;
Neither shalt thou be afraid of ⌈desolation⌉ when it cometh.

---

example of the "ascending numeration," of which there are a good many cases in the OT. The meaning is, that six would be a large number, but it is increased to seven. So in other cases: a number which would be complete or sufficient by itself is increased—or, if it denotes a sin, for instance, is aggravated—by a unit (cp. G–K. 134*s*). For *six* and *seven* (as here) see Pr. 6^{16}, where seven instances are given in the following vv.$^{(17-19)}$; so with *nine* and *ten* in Sir. 25^{7}; *two* and *three*, Sir. 50^{25}; *three* and *four*, Pr. 30^{18}. In other cases, even when instances follow, they are not made to equal either of the numbers previously mentioned (so Am. 1^{3-11}). Here, in vv.$^{20-22}$, there is some appearance of the mention of seven distresses: viz. famine, ^{20a}; war, ^{20b}; slander, ^{21a}; destruction, ^{21b}; destruction and dearth, ^{22a}; wild beasts, ^{22b}. But if precisely seven instances were intended, the text must have suffered; for two of the instances, at least in 𝔐, are identical, viz., destruction, ^{21b} (שׁד) and ^{22a} (שׁד); and famine and dearth are practically identical. Perhaps, however, in any case, one occurrence of "destruction" should be removed by reading for שׁד in ^{21} שׁאה, *desolation* (Dr.), or שֵׁד, a *demon* (Hoffm.), in which latter case we might perhaps compare Ps. 91^{6}. Seven instances were certainly not given by the writer, though they may have been intended by the interpolator, if Be. Bu. Du. are right in regarding ^{22} as interpolated, partly on the ground of the repetition of destruction and the virtual repetition of hunger, partly on the ground that ^{23} is more forcible if not anticipated by ^{22b}.

20. In famine and war—those scourges of the ancient East—his life will be secure.

21. *The scourge of the tongue*] *I.e.* slander, calumny. Cf. for the figure, Jer. 18^{18} "Come, let us *smite him* (Jer.) *with the tongue*." "Slander" is a rather special "distress" as com-

22 At destruction and dearth thou shalt laugh;
And of the beasts of the earth be thou not afraid.
23 For thou shalt be in league with the stones of the field;
And the beasts of the field shall be at peace with thee.

---

pared with the others instanced. Du. suggests that "pestilence," perhaps דֶּבֶר, the only one of the four sore judgments mentioned in Ezk. 14^{21} and not mentioned here, may once have been mentioned instead of the tongue; Ehrlich suggests that tongue stands for tongue (of fire).

22. *The beasts of the earth*] Wild beasts were much dreaded in Palestine in ancient times, especially if the country was depleted of its population (*e.g.* 2 K. 17^{25}). They form one of Ezekiel's "four sore judgments": "the sword, famine, noisome beasts, and pestilence" (14^{21}).

23. Poetical figures, implying that stones will not accumulate to mar the fields, nor wild beasts attack the folds or trample down the crops. Job's flocks and herds, and his harvests, will thus be both plentiful and secure; cf. Hos. $2^{20\ (18)}$ (where *covenant* represents the same Heb. word as "league" here). The text scarcely requires emendation; otherwise an old suggestion of Rashi's, recently revised by Köhler (*Archiv für Religionswissensch.*, 1910, 75 ff.) and Be. (*ZATW*, 1915, 63 f.), would be attractive: for *stones* (אבני) *of the field* they substitute *elfs*, or *gnomes* (בני or ארני), impish beings which, according to widespread folklore, may be as injurious as wild beasts to agricultural prosperity; the parallel to "beasts of the field" in b would be admirable. For the term *sons*, or *lords*, *of the field*, which on this hypothesis would be applied to them, cp. the Arabic *'ahlu'l'arḍ*, *people of the land* (see, *e.g.*, Doughty, *Arabia Deserta*, i. 136). Be. suggests that these elfs may be companions or doubles of the *s'îrim* (EV. "satyrs": see *EBi. s.v.*). The emendations of Ehrlich (*sling-*)*stones of the devastator* (שדד), and Richter, *fatnesses* (שמני), may be dismissed.

24–26. His homestead will be prosperous, his offspring numerous, and he himself will be gathered to his fathers in a ripe and vigorous old age.

24. *Know*] His *knowledge* of his security will be the climax

24 And thou shalt know that thy tent is in peace;
And thou shalt visit thy homestead, and shalt miss nothing.
25 Thou shalt know also that thy seed shall be great,
And thine offspring as the herbage of the earth.
26 Thou shalt come to thy grave in firm strength (?),
As a shock of corn cometh up in its season.
27 Lo this, we have searched it out, so it is;
⌈We have⌉ hear(d) it, and note *thou* it for thyself.

VI. 1 And Job answered and said,

---

of his happiness.—*Visit*] or, *inspect*, to see that all is right. So, *e.g.*, Jer. 23^2; of a shepherd inspecting his sheep.—*Shalt miss nothing*] Nothing will have been stolen; no animal will have strayed away, or been devoured by a wild beast.

25. His offspring will be numerous. His lost children (c. 1) will thus be replaced.—*As the herbage of the earth*] For the comparison, cf. Ps. 72^{16}, they shall blossom out of the city like *the herbage of the earth*.

26. *In firm strength*] see phil. n.—*Cometh up*] to the threshing-floor (which was usually situated on an elevation, that the wind might blow the chaff away).

27. This, then, is what we have "sought out" (*i.e.* arrived at as the result of meditating on our experience); as *we* have thought it out, do *thou* take good note of it. Our conclusion has not been arrived at suddenly, and is worthy therefore ot thy attention.

VI. VII. Job's reply to Eliphaz's first speech.—Addressing first the friends (6^{2-30}: note the pl. in 6^{24-29}) rather than Eliphaz alone, Job defends the language of his previous speech (c. 3), for which Eliphaz had rebuked him, on the ground of his sufferings ($^{2-7}$), and reiterates his desire to die ($^{8-10}$); for why should he live, being without hope ($^{11-13}$), and without help or sympathy from his friends in the hour of his need ($^{14-23}$)? His friends rather have become his covert accusers: if they must accuse, let them at least do so openly ($^{24-30}$). Though innocent, his lot is hard—as is human life in general ($7^{1f.}$)—and pitiable: for he is racked with disease, without hope in this brief life or

2 O that my vexation were but weighed,
And my calamity laid in the balances together!
3 For then it would be heavier than the sand of the seas:
Therefore have my words been rash.
4 For the arrows of the Almighty are present with me,
The venom whereof my spirit drinketh up:
The terrors of God array (themselves) against me.

---

when it is over (7^{1-10}). Addressing God, probably from 7^1, at least from 7^7 ("remember" is 2nd sing.), and unmistakably from 7^{12} onwards, Job, after a brief appeal to God's compassion ($^{7-10}$), boldly and without restraint (^{11}) asks why He plagues him so continually ($^{12-21}$).

VI. 2–3. Job only wishes that his "vexation," *i.e.* (see on 5^2), the sense of undeserved treatment under which he is smarting, and which he has expressed in c. 3, could be weighed against his sufferings: it would then quickly appear that it was not excessive, and that it formed an abundant excuse for his words.—*My vexation*] with which Eliphaz (5^2) had taunted him.—*Together*] viz., with my vexation—of course, in the other scale.

3. *Heavier than the sand of the sea*] for the fig. cf. Pr. 27^3.—*Rash*] Job allows that his words have been rash, but submits that his sufferings form a sufficient excuse for them.

4. Job here—for the first time, distinctly—names God as the author of his afflictions. The thought of this is the sting which goads him to desperation—not the afflictions as such, but his feeling that they are sent upon him undeservedly by an angry God: it is on this account that his pains terrify and paralyse him. V.^{4} is a tristich, ^{b} (which is overlong) separating the more closely parallel lines $^{a.c}$. Like the similar case in 5^5, this may be due to some dislocation of the text. Du. combines ^{4c} with ^{7a} (emended: see phil. n. on ^{7a}), thus obtaining two possible, though not very good, distichs. The separation of ^{4a} from ^{4c} is questionable; and, ^{7a}, if it really goes with any part of ^{4}, is connected by "my soul" with the parallel "my spirit" in ^{4b}: in this case the first part of ^{7a} would require to be suitably emended. But though ^{4} for the reasons indicated is doubtful

5 Doth the wild ass bray when he hath grass?
Or loweth the ox over his fodder?
6 Can that which is insipid be eaten without salt?
Or is there any taste in the slime of purslain?

---

and ^{7} very strange, no certain reconstruction can be suggested. —*The arrows of God*] "Figures in the poetry of the OT. for the sicknesses, pains, and plagues with which He assails men, Ps. $38^{3 (2)}$ (Ps. $7^{14 (13)}$, Dt. 32^{23}, Ezk. 5^{16}; cf. c. $16^{12ff.}$)," Di.—*Present with me*] On the idiom, see phil. n. He is constantly and intensely conscious of them.—*Venom*] lit. *heat*; so Ps. 58^{5}, Dt. $32^{24. 33}$. As a poisoned arrow causes—if nothing worse—fever and irritation, so the "venom" of God's arrows—*i.e.* the intolerable thought that they are sent against him unjustly—penetrates his being, and disturbs his whole mental condition. —*Array* (themselves) *against me*] By a change of metaphor he picturesquely represents God's terrors as arraying themselves against him like a hostile army (cf., for the figure, 10^{17} $16^{12ff.}$). But, transposing two letters, we should, perhaps, read *undo me* (see phil. n.)—the vb. meaning properly, as Arab. shows, to *make turbid*; and hence fig. *destroy the happiness of*, *undo*.

5–7. Job's complaints are proof of the reality of his pain; does any animal complain when it has its natural and accustomed food? But Job's sufferings are like insipid and repulsive food, which no one can take without complaining.

5. *Wild ass*] 39^{5} n.—*Grass*] 39^{8} n.—*Fodder*] בליל (24^{6}, Is. 30^{24} †) is properly *mixed fodder* (√ בלל, to *mix*), fodder composed of different kinds of food; Lat. *farrago* (of spelt, barley, vetches, and pulse); Verg. *G.* 3. 205.

6. *The slime of purslain*] a plant, the flower of which, as it fades away, resolves itself into an insipid mucilaginous jelly. It is this tasteless jelly which is here alluded to. EV. "the white of an egg": very improbable; see phil. n. In *JQR* xv. 704 f. an identification is suggested of the *slime*, or *saliva* (*rîr*), of *ḥallāmûth* with the insipid liquid exuding from a soft kind of cheese termed in Arabic ḥâlûm or ḥallûm (*Lisânu 'l ʿArab.* xv. 38. 6 f.).

7. Job compares his sufferings to repulsive food. The

7 My soul refuseth to touch (them);
⌈It loatheth⌉ the sickness of my food.
8 Oh that I might have my request;
And that God would grant (me) the thing that I ⌈long⌉ for!
9 And that it would please God to crush me;
That he would let loose his hand, and snip me off!
10 So would there still be my comfort;
And I would ⌈exult⌉ in anguish that spareth not:
For I have not disowned the words of the Holy One.

"soul" is in Heb. psychology the seat of *desire* (*e.g.* Dt. 24^{15}, Hos. 4^{8}), and, in particular, of *appetite* (*e.g.* Dt. 14^{26} 23^{25}, Is. 29^{8}, Mic. 7^{1}, Pr. 23^{2}, where בעל נפש means a *greedy* man; c. 33^{20}, where see note); hence its use here. See, further, Dr. *Par. Psalt.* p. 459 f. V.^{7} is in detail very uncertain; see phil. n.

8–13. The intensity of his sufferings wrings from him the passionate cry for death ($^{8-10}$). He has no strength for the patience and life which Eliphaz (4^{6} 5^{22-26}) had inculcated ($^{11-13}$).

8. *My request*] the wish to die, expressed in c. 3.—*The thing that I long for*] 𝔐 has *my hope* of death, "with a delicate allusion to the 'hope' of deliverance and ultimate happiness with which Eliphaz (4^{6} 5^{16}) had sought to support him" (Di.). But (cp. Pr. 10^{24}) *my desire* (see phil. n.) would agree better with the feeling which Job had really expressed; as EVV., by the rendering "the thing that I *long* for," which is not a legitimate rendering of 𝔐, have unconsciously admitted.

9. *Let loose his hand*] not merely torment him and protract his misery, but give his hand free play and slay him outright. —*Snip me off* (יבצעני)] implying "cut off the thread of my life": cf. 27^{8}, Is. 38^{12} "from the thrum he will *snip me off* (יבצעני)."

10. *Comfort*] death would speedily end his sufferings.—*Exult*] see phil. n.—*Anguish that spareth not*] *i.e.* the last quick agonies of death.

10c. If the line is original it means, for I have not disowned or disregarded God's (moral commands) (cf. $23^{11f.}$; c. 31) —giving the reason (Di.) why God should grant his request, and at the same time showing that he has grounds for his

11 What is my strength, that I should wait?
And what is mine end, that I should be patient?
12 Is my strength the strength of stones?
Or is my flesh of bronze?
13 ⌈Behold,⌉ my help within me is nought,
And effectual counsel is driven quite from me.
14 ⌈He that withholdeth⌉ kindness from his friend
Forsaketh the fear of the Almighty.

"vexation" ([2]) at God's treatment of him, and for refusing to listen to Eliphaz's exhortations to admit his guilt. De. Hi. Bu. al. render, "Then would it be still my comfort—and I would leap in pain that spareth not—*that* I have not disowned the words of the Holy One," making the righteousness of his life the ground of his consolation in the last agonies of death. Du. also thinks the latter meaning was intended—but by an interpolator, who desiderated an explication of ^{10a}; with Sgf. he omits ^{10c}, thus making ^{10} a distich, not as now a tristich: on either view he thinks that ^{10c} only has meaning if Job believed in rewards and punishments after death (cp. Peake).

11–13. Job passionately describes his desperate condition. His strength is shattered: the only future he can "hope" for is death; and, how can he avoid being impatient when this is so long in coming and releasing him from his pains?

11. *That I should wait?*] for the happier future which Eliphaz had promised him ($5^{19ff.}$).—*What is my end*, etc.?] what hope have I of a happy end of my sufferings, that I should be patient under them?—*Be patient*] lit. *prolong my soul*: so the idiom for "impatient" is *short of soul*; cf. Nu. 21^4 (RVm.), Zec. 11^8, and elsewhere with רוח, as Ex. 6^9, Mic. 2^7, Pr. 14^{29}, Jb. 21^4; and אֶרֶךְ רוח, Ec. 7^8.

13. Inward (mental) help and resourcefulness also fail him, not less than physical strength: he can imagine no means of extricating himself from his desperate plight.

14–23. His friends have failed him in the hour of his need: they have not shown him the sympathy that was his due.

14. Job charges his friends with themselves, by their lack of sympathy, forsaking true religion: so 𝔖𝔙, whose text is at

15 My brethren have dealt faithlessly like a wādy,
Like the channels of wādys that pass away:
16 Which are turbid by reason of the ice,
When the snow hideth itself upon them:
17 What time they are scorched, they vanish away:
When it is hot, they are extinguished out of their place.

---

least more probable than 𝔐; the difficult and uncertain text of 𝔐 is best rendered: Kindness is (due) to him that is in despair, And that forsaketh the fear of the Almighty; according to this, Job, with allusion to himself, says that one who is in despair, and (in danger of) loosing his faith in the Almighty, deserves from his friends, not querulous insinuations of guilt, but help and sympathy, to strengthen his failing piety; and he is keenly disappointed at not receiving this from them. But against 𝔐, see phil. n.

15–20. He compares his friends picturesquely to a wādy, a stream—such as are common in and about Palestine—running along a rocky valley, which may be turbid and swollen in winter, but completely dry in summer; and his own disappointment to that of a thirsty caravan, journeying hopefully towards such a wādy, only to find its waters dried up through the heat. Cf. for the figure Jer. 15[18] "Wilt thou be to me as a deceptive wādy" (נַחַל אַכְזָב)?

15. *My brethren*] so Job here terms the three friends; cp. v.[21], which applies the simile here begun to those whom he is addressing.—*Channels*] or *bed*,—which, when in summer the traveller comes to it, he finds dry.

16. *Hideth itself upon them*] falls upon them, and disappears in them. "The streams of Lebanon," and the high parts of Gilead and Bashan, "send down great floods of dark and troubled waters in spring, when the ice and snow of their summits are melting; but they dry up under the heat of summer, and the track of the torrent, with its chaos of boulders, stones, and gravel, seems as though it had not known a stream for ages" (Geikie, *Holy Land and the Bible* (1887), i. 124).

17. But in the hot summer these wādys, swollen in winter, dry up.

18 Caravans divert their way;
They go up into the waste, and perish.
19 The caravans of Tema looked,
The companies of Sheba waited for them.
20 They were disappointed because ⌜they⌝ had hoped,
They came thither, and were abashed.

---

18. Travelling companies or "caravans," expecting to find water in such wādys, divert their course towards them, but upon reaching them find none and perish through thirst (so abandoning the vocalization of 𝔐, Ew. Ol. Di. Du. RV.), "go up," meaning, in this case, go up into the hills in search of mountain streams, but only to find everything dried up and desolate. But De. Da. Hi. Bu., adhering to 𝔐, less probably render "*the paths of their way* (the course of such streams) *wind about* (the thread of water, to which in summer they are reduced, has to make its way round every stone or other obstacle), they (the streams) go up into emptiness (evaporate) and disappear." On תֹּהוּ, *waste*, see Skinner, *Genesis*, p. 16; Dr. on Gen. i. 2; *Lex.* 1062*b* (where, however, the meanings *rage*, *roar*, *bluster*, for Aram. תהא must be deleted as due to an oversight: correct Levy, *ChWB* 83*b*, 530*d*, by *NHWB* iv. 628). The word may denote either an *empty waste* (Jb. 12^{24}, Ps. 107^{40}, Dt. 32^{10}), or (as in the second rendering) actual *emptiness* or (virtual) *nothingness* (cf. 26^{7}, Is. 40^{23}, the judges of the earth he maketh as *nothingness*).

19. *Tema*] a trading Ishmaelite tribe—mentioned in Gn. 25^{15} by the side of Nebaioth, Kedar, and other tribes, as a "son" of Ishmael, and also in Is. 21^{14}, Jer. 25^{23}. The name is still preserved in *Teimā*, the name of a place in N.W. Arabia, about 250 miles S.E. of Edom, and the centre of trade-routes (cf. Hogarth, *Penetration of Arabia* (1905), p. 250, "evidently of old a more important road-station than it now is"), where some interesting inscriptions have been found (Cooke, *NSI*, nos. 69, 70), the longest dating from about the 5 cent. B.C.—*Looked*] expectantly and wistfully. The poet, in using the past tenses, pictures a particular scene.—*Sheba*] 1^{15}.

20. Job's friends, living like himself on or near the borders

21 ⌜So⌝ are ye now become unto ⌜me⌝;
Ye see a terror, and are afraid.
22 Did I say, Give unto me?
Or, Offer a bribe for me of your substance?
23 Or, Deliver me from the adversary's hand?
Or, Redeem me from the hand of the terrible?

---

of the Arabian desert, would feel the force of the simile.—*Were disappointed*] the Heb. idiom is lit. *were put to shame*, *i.e.* not "felt a sense of shame," but "were disconcerted by the frustration of plans and hopes." So frequently, as Ps. $6^{11\,(10)}$ $22^{6\,(5)}$ $25^{2.\,3.\,20}$ etc. The word is often used of the disappointment experienced by those who rely upon false gods, or untrustworthy political friends, as Is. 20^5 44^{11}, Jer. 2^{36}. *To be abashed* (^{b}) is often parallel, as Ps. 35^{26} 40^{15}. Comp. Is. 1^{29} "and ye shall be put to shame (= be disappointed) on account of the oaks ye have desired [not obtaining from them the expected help or deliverance], and ye shall *be abashed* on account of the gardens ye have chosen."

21. Job's friends now fail (disappoint) him in the hour of need, like such dried-up wādys (see phil. n.).—*Ye see* (תראו) *a terror, and are afraid* (ותיראו)] notice the assonance in the Hebrew: so Zec. 9^5, Ps. 40^4 52^8 al. The "terror" is Job's overwhelming calamity: judging this to be sent upon him by God, and to be sent upon him, moreover, as a punishment for his sins, they have not the courage to show him sympathy.

22–23. He had asked nothing very great of his friends, no expenditure of money, or deed of valour, for instance, on his behalf, but merely sympathy.

22. *A bribe*] in accordance with the too prevalent Eastern custom (Is. 1^{23}, Mic. 3^{11} etc.), to secure his acquittal from a judge.—*Substance*] lit. *strength* (כֹּחַ): so Pr. 5^{10}.

23. He had never asked to be delivered from any situation of peril or difficulty: to be rescued, for instance, by arms from the hands of brigands, or to be ransomed, whether from brigands or from enslavement by a cruel creditor for debt. With ^{b} comp. Jer. 15^{21} "And I will deliver thee from the hand of the evil, and I will *redeem* thee from the clutch of the

24 Teach me, and *I* will hold my peace:
And cause me to understand wherein I have erred.
25 How ⌜pleasant⌝ are words of uprightness!
But what doth reproving from you prove?
26 Do ye think to reprove words?
But the speeches of one that is desperate are for the wind.
27 Yea, ye would cast (lots) upon the fatherless,
And make merchandise over your friend.
28 Now, therefore, be pleased to look upon me;
For surely I shall not lie to your face.

---

terrible." The "terrible" (עריץ) may be any powerful and dreaded oppressor or tyrant, whether native or foreign: 15[20] 27[13] (each time || to "wicked"), Is. 25[4. 5] 29[5. 20], Ps. 54[5] (|| 86[14]). Peake suggests that [27] once immediately followed [23]: so far from ransoming me, you would rather have bartered me away.

24–30. In answer to Eliphaz's covert insinuations, he claims to be told plainly what sins they impute to him. Hitherto they have only found fault expressly with his *words*, which, however, were merely wrung from him by his despair ([26]). He reproaches them for their unfeeling treatment of him ([27]), and beseeches them to judge him fairly.

25. *Pleasant*] see phil. n.—*Words of uprightness*] honest, straightforward words, such as Job cannot discern in Eliphaz's speech.—*Reproving from you*] what do your vague and dark insinuations prove?

26. Is it your purpose to reprove—not my life indeed, but —my *words* (those spoken in c. 3): but the words of one who is desperate, such as those were, are for the wind—are quickly blown away, so that they need not be taken too seriously (cf. [8b]).

27. His friends, he declares, are as heartless as ruthless creditors, who would cast lots for the orphan child of a man who had been their debtor, in order to sell it into slavery (2 K. 4[1]), or as men who would make a bargain over their friend. But see phil. n., and above on [23].

28. *Be pleased*] *i.e.* Be good enough, or "Please!" His

4 When I lie down, I say, When shall I arise?
But the evening is long; and I am full of tossings to and fro unto the (morning) twilight.
5 My flesh is clothed with worms and clods of dust;
My skin hardens, and then runneth (again).
6 My days are swifter than a weaver's shuttle,
And are come to an end without hope.

26^4 men of ***unreality*** (*i.e.* insincere or frivolous), $41^{7\,(6)}$ (= insincerity), 119^{37}: so Ex. 20^7 Thou shalt not take up the name of Yahweh thy God ***for unreality*** (*i.e.* use it for any false or frivolous object). Cf. on 15^{31}.—***Nights of misery***] lit. *of toil* (עָמָל): see on 3^{10}. The "months" indicate the duration, the "nights" the intensity, of his sufferings (Pe.).

4–6. A graphic description of the condition to which his malady has brought him: his wearisome, restless nights, his loathsome disease, his days ebbing quickly (cp. ^{7a}), without hope of recovery or relief (cp. ^{7b}), to their close.

4. ***When shall I arise?***] When will it be morning? (Dt. 28^{67}).—***But the evening is long; and***] or, since the Hebrew is unusual and to gain a better parallelism, very slightly emending (see phil. n.), ***And as often as evening*** (*comes*).

5. His ulcers breed worms, form a hard crust, and then break out and run again.

6a. Cp. 9^{25} My days are swifter than a post. On ancient weaving, from which the simile in ^{a} is derived, see Kennedy in *EBi.* iv. 5276–5290 (with illustrations). Ibn Ezra notes that ^{b} may continue the simile of ^{a} if תקוה be given the sense it has in Jos. 2^{18}: and so Marshall renders ^{b}, "They come to an end for lack of thread": but this would require מבלי rather than באפס.

7–10. He turns pathetically to God, beseeching Him to remember how brief his life is, and to have compassion on him for the short time that remains before he descends for ever into the grave. In Sheol, according to Hebrew ideas, there was no fellowship with God: the Shades, in their dreary, shadow-like existence, were "cut off from God's hand," and could neither praise Him, nor experience His benefits (Ps. 6^6 $88^{6.\,11-13}$, Is. 38^{18}).

7 Oh remember that my life is wind:
    Mine eye will no more see good.
8 The eye of him that seeth me will behold me no more:
    Thine eyes will be upon me, but I shall not be.
9 A cloud cometh to an end and vanisheth away;
    So he that goeth down to Sheol cometh up no more.
10 He returneth no more to his house,
    Neither doth his place know him any more.

---

7. *Remember*] the vb., like the pron. in ^{8}, is 2nd sing., addressed not to Eliphaz (cp. 26^{2} n.) but to God: but for what follows, 7^{1-6} (like 6^{24-30}) could be regarded as still addressed to the friends; as it is, these verses are best regarded as, if not transitional in the tone of soliloquy, the beginning of the address to God with which the speech most clearly closes ($^{12-21}$).—*Wind*] a symbol of what is transient and unsubstantial: Ps. 78^{39}, Is. 41^{29}, Qoh. 1^{14} etc.—*Good*] *i.e.* happiness, prosperity: "good" (טוֹב), as Ps. 4^{7} 34^{13} (each time with "see"), Jb. 21^{13} 36^{11}, and frequently: so also טובה, 9^{25} 21^{25} al.

8. Soon ª none will behold him any more: ᵇ even God, if He should wish to show him some kindness, will be unable to find him. The v. is absent from 𝔊, repeats the words "eye" (twice) and "see" used in ^{7}, anticipates ^{10} and the close of the speech (^{21}), and separates ^{7} and ^{9} which go well together; it may, therefore, be an addition to the original text (so Bi. Bu. al.). ª strictly rendered reads: the eye of him that seeth me will not behold me; the translation above presupposes that "seeth me" means *seeth* me *now*; perhaps it rather means *looks for* me *in the future*, though 20^{7} is scarcely decisive, and in passages such as 2 S. 13^{5}, 2 K. 8^{29} (cp. *Lex.* s.v. ראה, 6 d), cited as justifying the rendering of ראה by *look for*, the meaning is not exactly the same, not even in Gn. 39^{23}.

9, 10. No return from Sheol is possible (10^{21}).

10b. So Ps. 103^{16b}; cf. also c. 20^{9b}.

11–21. A passionate remonstrance with God. Why does He thus torture him, and make his life a burden to him? Is not man too insignificant to be thus persecuted by his Maker? Why does He not at once pardon his transgression, and take

29 Turn back, I pray you, let there be no unrighteousness;
Yea, turn back, my righteousness is still in ⌜me⌝.
30 Is there unrighteousness in my tongue?
Cannot my palate discriminate calamities?

---

friends, we may suppose, had turned their eyes from him while he had been descanting on their lack of sympathy: so he entreats them now to look him in the face, as he can look them in the face, and judge from his countenance whether, in maintaining his innocence, he is lying to them.—*To your face*] defiantly, as 1^{11}.

29. *Turn back*] from the unfair course you have adopted: do not unjustly assume my guilt.—*My righteousness is still in me*] 𝔐 *in it*; *i.e.* (Hrz. Di.) in the matter under discussion, I am still unconvicted, or (Du.) I am justified in speaking as I do, or (Da.) *my right is still in it*, *i.e.* "is here, is present. I have a righteous cause." But all these explanations of *in it* are unsatisfactory and lame; and it is better, with Hi. Bi.[2] Bu. (note) Sgf. Be., to read *in me* (בי for בה), which at once yields the suitable and natural sense: I am still unconvicted.

30. Job insists on the soundness of his moral judgments. There is no unrighteousness in (or on) his tongue; his tongue does not, when it declares his innocence, express a judgment morally unsound; and his "palate," the organ of taste (12^{11}) to which his troubles are loathsome ($6^{6f.}$), has the power of distinguishing between "calamities" (v.[2]), and perceiving whether or not they are deserved and just. In maintaining that his calamities have been undeserved, he has been guilty of no unrighteousness.

VII. This consciousness of innocence, and of his capacity to judge his calamities correctly, makes him feel his position the more acutely; and he breaks forth into a fresh and singularly pathetic cry of despair on his lamentable and hopeless condition.

1–3. Life is hard always: his own, vexed by loss of children and property, torturing disease, and a burning sense of injustice, hard especially.

VII. 1 Hath not man a warfare upon earth?
And are not his days like the days of an hireling?
2 As a servant that is eager for the shadow,
And as an hireling that looketh for his wages:
3 So am I made to possess months of emptiness,
And nights of misery are appointed to me.

---

1. *Warfare*] a time of hard service, like a campaign, a constant struggle with difficulties and hardship, never ceasing till the time for which the soldier has been engaged has expired. The word is used similarly in 14^{14}, Is. 40^{2}.—*Of an hireling*] a hired labourer, whose life is one of unceasing toil, and who has constantly to endure the "burden and heat of the day" (Mt. 20^{12}). The word might also denote a mercenary (Jer. 46^{21}); but ^{2b} makes the former sense more probable.

2. *A servant*] or *slave*: a field-labourer is more particularly thought of.—*For the shadow*, etc.] the shades of evening, which are so long in coming, but when he can enjoy cool air and rest, and when also he will be paid for his day's work. Labourers in the East were paid daily: cf. Dt. 24^{15} ("in his day" thou shalt give him his wages), Mt. 20^{8}. "The point of comparison between Job's life and the day of the hireling thus lies in their common toil and their common longing for the end of it" (Da.).

3. *Am made to possess* (or *inherit*] "A pathetic word, *made to inherit*, through no fault or cause of mine" (Da.[1]), but by the mere arbitrary will of him whose slave I am.—*Months of emptiness*] months of uselessness, disappointment, and vexation. שָׁוְא denotes what is *hollow*, *groundless*, and *unsubstantial*; and it is applied, according to the context, to what is (*a*) *materially* unsubstantial, i.e. *unreal*, or *vain*, or (*b*) *morally* unsubstantial, i.e. *frivolous*, *false*, or *insincere*. Cf. for (*a*) Ex. 23^{1} Thou shalt not take up a *groundless* report, Jer. 18^{15} (= *unreal* gods), Ps. $31^{7(6)}$ "*unreal* vanities" (of false gods), $60^{13(11)}$ for *vain* is the help of man, $89^{48(47)}$ O remember how short my time is: for what *vanity* (uselessness, emptiness of life, disappointment) hast thou created all the children of men! and for (*b*) Ps. $12^{3(2)}$ (= insincerity), 24^{4} (= what is either frivolous or insincere),

17 What is man, that thou magnifiest him,
    And that thou directest thine attention to him,
18 And that thou visitest him every morning,
    And triest him every moment?
19 How long wilt thou not look away from me,
    Nor let me alone while I swallow down my spittle?

---

him?" "The Psalmist, impressed with the wonders of the starry heavens, asks what is man that God should be so mindful of him, and place him in a position of such high authority in the world. Job asks, not why God should lavish on a creature so insignificant such honour and thoughtful care, but why he should be subjected to attention so alert and suspicious, as if he could really be of any importance. Job's morbid imagination distorts the unsleeping care of God into a maddening espionage. . . . How petty His character must be, since He condescends to torture one so frail, and harry him with persecution so untiring" (Peake).

17. *Magnifiest*] *i.e.* ironically, think much of, consider of importance, viz. by counting him worthy of constant (unfriendly) attention.—*Directest thine attention to him*] lit. *settest thine heart upon*, a common idiom and meaning, *pay heed to*, *consider* (Ex. 7^{23}, 1 S. 4^{20}, Ps. $48^{14\,(13)}$; and with a synonym (*sīm*) for "set," Jb. 1^{8} 2^{3} al.). EVV. *set thine heart upon* suggests a false sense; for in ordinary English it would mean *set thy affection on*: but in Heb. psychology the "heart" is not the organ of affection, as in English (cf. "heart-less"), but of *understanding* (cf. 8^{10} 36^{5}): so אין לב (Hos. 7^{11}) is not "heartless," but *without understanding*, or as we might say colloquially "without a head," or "without brains" (the "head" in Heb. is never the seat of thought or intelligence).

18. *Visitest him*] not, as Ps. 8^{5}, with marks of providential care, but to prove him: cp. the parallel term here, and the same vb. (with the ||) in 31^{14}.—*Triest*] i.e. *test* or *prove*, Gn. $42^{15.16}$: of God, as testing by His all-seeing scrutiny the thoughts and character of men, Ps. $7^{10\,(9)}$ 11^{4} 17^{3} 26^{2} 139^{23}, or as proving man's faith or obedience by discipline, Ps. 66^{10} $81^{8\,(7)}$.

19. How long, Job indignantly asks, will God continue to

20 If I have sinned, what do I unto thee,
O thou keeper of men?
Why hast thou set me as a thing for thee to strike against,
So that I am a burden to myself?
21 And why dost thou not take away my transgression,
And cause mine iniquity to pass away?

---

direct upon him incessantly His malevolent glance?—*Look away*] so 14^{6}, Ps. 39$^{14(13)}$; cf. Is. 22^{4}.—*Let me alone*] more exactly, *let me drop* or *let me go* (Ca. 3^{4} אֲחַזְתִּיו וְלֹא אַרְפֶּנּוּ; Jb. 27^{6}, Pr. 4^{13}); often in a favourable sense, Dt. 4^{31} לֹא יַרְפְּךָ וְלֹא יַשְׁחִיתֶךָ, 31$^{6.8}$, Jos. 1^{5}.—*Till I swallow*, etc.] a proverbial expression = *for a moment*: Schult. *ad loc.* (Ges. *Thes.* 213) cites the Arabic expression, "Let me swallow my spittle" (*'abli'ni riḳi*), meaning, "Wait a moment."

20, 21. Even assuming that he has sinned, how, he asks, can this in any way injure God, that He should continue to persecute him? Job denies consistently that he has ever sinned to a degree that would justify his extraordinary sufferings: why then, seeing his sins can be but venial ones, will He not forgive him before forgiveness is too late?

20. The rhythm of $^{a.b}$ is strange: Be.^{K} om.—*What do I unto thee?*] What harm do I do Thee by my sin? God is too holy, too exalted, to be affected by any of man's actions, whether good or bad (22$^{2-4}$ 35$^{5-8}$).—*O thou keeper of men*] the verb, used often of God's fatherly care and protection of His servants (Is. 27^{3}, Ps. 12$^{8(7)}$ 31$^{24(23)}$ etc. [EVV. *preserve*]) is here, with bitter irony (cp. $^{17f.}$), applied so as to yield a title of reproach, to denote God as one who "keeps," or guards, men closely, in order to prevent them escaping from Him, and to note their actions.—*Thing to strike against*] an object of deliberate and persistent attack. Cf. the cogn. verb in 1 K. 2$^{25.29.31}$ etc. (EVV. *fall upon*).—*So that I am a burden to myself?*] *i.e.* weary of myself and of my life. For the expression, cf. 2 S. 15^{33}. On the reading *to thee*, see phil. n.

21. If he *has* inadvertently sinned, why, since his sin cannot affect God, does He not pardon it at once, instead of waiting to do so till it is too late?—*Take away*] in EVV. usually

11 I also will not refrain my mouth;
I will speak in the anguish of my spirit;
I will complain in the bitterness of my soul.
12 Am I a sea, or a sea-monster,
That thou settest a watch over me?

---

pity on him? Job goes here far beyond the point he had reached in c. 3. There, though he had complained bitterly of his lot, he had said little against God. Here he openly charges Him with being his tormentor, and ironically taunts Him with turning His care for him into a means of persecuting him.

11. *I also*] As God shows no regard for man, but lets him pass from a life of misery into a night of darkness, so he also will show no regard for Him by restraint of speech, but he will give full vent to his complaint. The "also" expresses the correspondence of one action to another, especially in retaliation (the גם "correlativum": *Lex.* 169*b*): cf. Hos. 4^{6}, Jer. 4^{12}, Ps. $52^{7(6)}$ (EVV. "likewise") 71^{22}.

12. He asks indignantly, Am I, frail mortal that I am, like a dangerous monster to be guarded strictly by its keeper? Am I like the turbulent sea, threatening, when its angry waves arise, to overpass the barriers imposed on it by God (cf. 38^{8-11}; Jer. 5^{22} 31^{35}, Ps. 104^{9})? Or, with an allusion to the dragon Tiamat,—the personification of the unruly powers of chaos, and more or less identified with the roaring waters of the huge primæval abyss (cf. Gn. 1^{2b}),—who, as Babylonian mythology told, had been slain by the Creator Marduk[1] (cf. 9^{13}), *Am I a sea-monster, that thou settest a watch over me*, lest I should do some great damage in the world (cp. 38^{8-12} n.)?—*Sea-monster*] תנין, a serpent, sometimes of a land-reptile, Ex. $7^{9.10.12}$, Dt. 32^{33}, Ps. 91^{13}; more often of a sea- (or river-) monster, Gn. 1^{21}, of the Egyptians or Pharaoh under fig. of a crocodile, Ps. 74^{13}, Ezk. 32^{2} (rd. תנין for תנים), of a mythological or imaginary *dragon*, Is. 27^{1} 51^{9}, Jer. 51^{34}.

13–14. The methods used by God to keep Job harmless: when he looks to the natural rest of sleep to give him some

[1] Cf. the Fourth Tablet of the Creation Epic (Rogers, *Cuneiform Parallels to the OT.*, 1912, p. 24 ff.), esp. l. 95 ff.

13 When I say, My bed shall comfort me,
My couch shall ease my complaint;
14 Then thou scarest me with dreams,
And terrifiest me through visions:
15 So that my soul chooseth strangling,
And death rather than my ⌜pains⌝.
16 I refuse (it)! not for ever would I live!
Desist from me! for my days are (as) a breath.

---

relief, then He scares him with terrifying dreams—such as are said to be one of the accompaniments of elephantiasis.

13. *Ease*] lit. *bear in, i.e.* help in bearing: so Nu. 11^{17} Heb.—*Complaint*] (sad) musing: see 9^{27} n.

15. And so he prefers death to the continuance of these intolerable sufferings. *Strangling* (cf. the verb, 2 S. 17^{23}), *i.e.* suffocation, may be mentioned with allusion to the sense of choking, which is often experienced in elephantiasis. For *my pains* (עצבותי) (9^{28}, Ps. 147^{3}), 𝕸 has *my bones* (עצמותי), which, if correct, will be equivalent to what we should express by *this skeleton*: but the explanation is forced; and it is better changing one letter to read *my pains.*

16. He exclaims passionately that he cares nothing for life: he only entreats God to leave him at peace for the short time that he has still to live.—*I refuse* (it)] *i.e.* my life: the object must be supplied from the context; cf. 9^{21} "I refuse my life." —*Not for ever*] would he *live*, even if he could, such a life as his has become: on these terms life is intolerable to him, though on other terms only the brevity of life would be distressing (^{6a}).—*Desist*] or *cease* (Is. 1^{16}, Am. 7^{5}), *forbear* (16^{6}, 1 K. 22^{6}, Zec. 11^{12}, and often): exactly as here, Ex. 14^{12} *cease, desist from us = let us alone.*—*A breath*] Is. 57^{13} "*a breath* will take them": Heb. הֶבֶל, also, like "wind" (^{7}), a fig. of what is transient: usually in EVV. rendered *vanity*: Ps. $39^{6.\,7.\,12\,(5.\,6.\,11)}$ $62^{10.\,10\,(9.\,9)}$ 144^{4} (all, of man); Qoh. 1^{2} הבל הבלים, "*vanity* of *vanities*," and constantly in that book: also in other books of what is unsubstantial and unreal, as false gods, Dt. 32^{21} al.

17–18. A bitter parody of Ps. $8^{5\,(4)}$ "What is man, that thou art mindful of him? And the son of man, that thou visitest

6 If thou art pure and upright;
  Surely now he will arouse himself on thy behalf,
  And restore the habitation of thy righteousness.
7 And though thy beginning was small,
  Thy latter end will be exceeding great.
8 For inquire, I pray thee, of the former generations,
  And apply thyself to that which their fathers have searched out:

---

5. *Thou*] emphatic, in opposition to his children.—*Seek earnestly*] 7^{21}.

6. *Arouse himself*] interpose actively: cf. Ps. 35^{23} "*Arouse thyself* and awake to my judgment."—*Restore*] properly *make whole, complete*, often in the sense *make whole by payment, pay in full, make good* (Ex. $21^{34.36}$ $22^{2(3).11(12)}$, Lv. 24^{18}). 𝔊 *ἀποκαταστήσει*: cp. the Syr. ܢܫܠܡ (Pa.) in Mt. 17^{11} *καὶ ἀποκαταστήσει πάντα*.—*The habitation of thy righteousness*] the habitation which, by its prosperity, will be evidence of the righteousness of its possessor. The "habitation" (5^{3} n.) must be pictured as a homestead in the country with numerous slaves and abundant herds and flocks, such as is described in 1^{2-3}.

7. Keeping closer to the Hebrew idiom we may render: *And* so *thy beginning*, *i.e.* thy former estate, *will be* (seem) *small* in comparison with what thou wilt enjoy then, *and thy latter end* (the closing years of thy life) *will be exceeding great.* In these words the poet allows Bildad to utter a prophecy, the fulfilment of which is recorded in 42^{12}: "And Yahweh blessed the latter end of Job more than his beginning."

8–10. Cp. 15^{17-19} (Eliphaz). The doctrine which Bildad propounds is no new one, derived from the ignorance of mere creatures of yesterday (v.[9]): it is based upon the experience and research of the immemorial past.

8. *Inquire*, etc.] cp. Dt. 32^{7b}.—*The former generations*] the Hebrew phrase is sing. (דור ראשון): hence EV. "the former age"; but the reference is not to some particular generation in the past as, for example, as some have suggested, the generation of such men as Methuselah, who lived vastly longer lives than the long lives of Job and his friends, who themselves

9 (For we are but of yesterday, and know nothing,
Because our days upon earth are a shadow:)

---

belong to the patriarchal period. But the whole past of mankind is regarded as a single generation (דור); and this generation is immeasurably more ancient than *individuals* like Job. The phrase is virtually equal to "antiquity" in the phrase "the voice of antiquity," as the antithetical phrase דור אחרון, *the latter generation*, is virtually equal to "posterity" (in such a phrase as "the judgment of posterity") in Ps. 48^{14} $78^{4. 6}$ $102^{19 (18)}$ (‖ "people yet to be created"), and, with the article in prose, in Dt. 29^{21}. The "former generation" is the generation containing all the former (people: ראשנים); the "latter generation," the generation containing all the latter (people), mankind past and future being divisible into two groups—the former and the latter (people: Qoh. 1^{11}). Men living at any particular moment are in touch with this former generation, and can ask it, now hoary aged, for its wisdom, as they are also in touch with the youthful generation to come, and can pass on to it in its childhood what they have learnt from the past (Ps. 48^{14}). But if *their fathers* is correctly read in ^{b}, this quasi-personification of the entire past of mankind is resolved in the parallel line, and the appeal is to the fathers of those who composed the later individuals among the "former people"; to some degree, though not entirely parallel, is the combination of "the latter generation" and "their sons" in Ps. 78^{6}—not entirely parallel, for there the insertion of the parallel term "sons yet to be born" eases the transition. But *the fathers* (𝔊), or *our fathers* (see phil. n.) would be a stricter parallelism; cp. "the latter generation, your sons" in Dt. 29^{21}.—*Apply thyself to*] Heb. *fix* (*thy mind*) *to*; but we should perhaps read *attend to* (see phil. n.).

9. Left to ourselves we shortlived individuals know nothing; but we can receive the knowledge of the past. Bildad's position is that what is true is not new, and what is new is not true; that Job is wrong, because he is propounding a monstrous new doctrine; and Bildad right, because he is simply repeating an old doctrine, so old that it must be true. Peake objects that

For now shall I lie down in the dust;
And thou wilt seek me diligently, but I shall not be.

VIII. 1 Then answered Bildad the Shuḥite, and said,
2 How long wilt thou speak these things?
And (how long will) the words of thy mouth be (like) a mighty wind?
3 Doth God pervert judgment?
Or doth the Almighty pervert justice?

---

rendered *pardon* or *forgive*, as Gn. 50^{17}, Ex. 32^{32}.—*Cause . . . to pass away*] as 2 S. 12^{13} 24^{10}, Zec. 3^{4}.—*Now*] *i.e.* immediately. —*Lie down in the dust*] 21^{26}: cp. 19^{25} n.—*Seek me diligently*] a single word in the Heb., occurring twelve times in poetry, and implying diligent, careful, or earnest search. Job still believes, in spite of all that he has said, that God is a God of love, who will one day seek earnestly to renew His former communion with His servant, and visit him again with His favour, but he will have passed into Sheol, and it will be too late!

VIII. Bildad's first speech.—In spite of Job's violent accusations, God is not unjust ($^{2.\,3}$): Job's children have died an untimely death it is true, but that was because they were wicked (^{4}); but Job himself still lives, and, *if* he is really righteous, God's justice will restore, and more than restore, his former prosperity ($^{5-7}$). Let Job learn from the experience of past generations ($^{8-10}$) that God does not suffer the wicked to enjoy any continuing prosperity ($^{11-19}$), nor ever subjects to continuing adversity the class to which Job claims to belong—that of the perfect ($^{20-22}$).

2. Cp. 18^{2} (Bildad's second speech).—*These things*] *i.e.* such things as these,—especially the charge that God assails him unjustly (7^{12-20}).—*Like a mighty wind*] *i.e.* at once violent and empty.

3. An indignant retort; God does not, as Job declares, rule the world unjustly. As their position in the Heb. shows, "God" and "the Almighty" are the emphatic words in the sentence: God, the Almighty, cannot pervert justice; what

4 If thy children have sinned against him,
Then he hath delivered them into the hand of their transgression.
5 If *thou* wilt seek diligently unto God,
And make thy supplication to the Almighty;

---

has happened to Job cannot be unjust, because it comes from God.

4. Illustration of God's justice on its negative side: as God cannot do injustice, the death of Job's children is evidence of their sin. Bildad says *if*, from a desire to spare Job, but he means *Because*. The allusion to 1^{19} is obvious, and is not to be, and is not, avoided by making $^{4-6a}$ protasis, and, omitting ^{6b}, making the apodosis begin at ^{6c} (Ehrlich). The conclusion is, of course, fallacious; for though it is true that God does nothing unjustly, it is *not* true, as the friends throughout tacitly assume, that the *sole* principle by which God is guided in His dealings with man is that of retributive justice.—*Delivered them*, etc.] that they might suffer the punishment, which it would naturally bring with it. For the thought, cf. Is. $64^{6\,(7)}$ RVm. (reading תְּמַגְּנֵנוּ for ותמוגנו); for the quasi-personification of transgression, Nu. 32^{23} (n.).—*Into the hand*] cp. 1^{12} n.

5–7. Job had suffered, but not to the extent that his children had; his life had been spared: hence, if he will but turn to God—as Eliphaz also had exhorted him to do (5^{8})—*if* he is only, as he maintains, pure and upright, God will interpose on his behalf, and restore him to greater prosperity than ever. Bildad speaks with moderation and friendliness. From the severity of Job's sufferings he might (upon his principles) have inferred, and undoubtedly did infer, that he had sinned greatly; but he leaves this inference unsaid. And in ^{6}, though the condition, *If thou art pure*, etc., cannot, in the belief of the friends, be satisfied by Job, he still assumes it, and promises him, if it is true, a favourable issue, hoping that Job will be thus indirectly brought to see that, since God does not repel, or (^{20}) cast off, the righteous, and he *is* cast off, and, as Bildad expects, will remain cast off, he is not himself as righteous as he maintains himself to be.

15 He leaneth upon his house, but it standeth not:
He holdeth fast thereby, but it endureth not.
16 Full of sap is he before the sun,
And his shoots go forth over his garden.
17 His roots are twined over the heap,
He ⌈pierceth⌉ the place of stones.
18 If one destroy him out of his place,
Then it will deny him (saying), I have not seen thee.

---

confidence (on) gossamer is (placed), see phil. n.—*Trust*] *i.e.* object of trust, as 18^{14} Heb., 31^{24}, Jer. 48^{13}, Ezk. 29^{16} (EVV. *confidence*).—*A spider's web*] Heb. *house*. An obvious emblem of fragility: cf. 27^{18} n., Is. $59^{5.6}$. Hirzel compares aptly Qor. 29^{40} "the likeness of those who take to themselves patrons beside God is as the likeness of the spider who taketh to herself a house; and verily the *frailest of houses is the spider's house* (*baitu 'l ʿankabûti*)."

15. Development of, or (Bu.) a gloss on, ^{14b}. His own "house" is as fragile as the spider's: though he leans upon it, and holds it firmly, it affords him no support. "House" is naturally to be taken here in a broad sense, including his family, establishment, and the resources implied in the possession of an estate.

16–18. Another comparison to a plant. Such a man is like a creeper, firmly rooted in a garden, thriving in the warmth of the sun, and spreading luxuriantly, which, however, if it is once destroyed, is utterly and for ever forgotten. The figure and the thing signified are blended into one by the poet: the subject of the description is the godless man, conceived and pictured as a plant.

16. *Full of sap*] properly *moist*; cf. the cognate verb, 24^{8} (EVV. *are wet*) †.—*Before the sun*] under the fostering heat of the sun.

17. *Pierceth*] Or (with other points) *taketh hold of*: see phil. n. 𝔐 *beholdeth*.—*Place of stones*] questionable: see phil. n.

18. *Destroy*] lit. *swallow up*, fig. for entire annihilation. So 2^{3} (see n.) al. The unnamed subject may be either "he"

19 Behold, that is the joy of his way,
And out of the dust another spring⌜eth⌝.
20 Behold, God rejecteth not a perfect man,
And taketh not hold of the hand of evil-doers
21 He will yet fill thy mouth with laughter,
And thy lips with shouting.
22 They that hate thee will be clothed with shame,
And the tent of the wicked will be no more.

(God), or חַמְבַלְּעַ (= "one"); see on 3^{20} phil. n.; and add E. König, *Stilistik. Rhetorik. Poetik*, p. 115.—*I have not seen thee*] a formula of emphatic repudiation (Dt. 33^{9}).

19. *That is the joy of his way*] *i.e.* of his path in life: the "joy," of which he was himself so proud, and which may have been envied by others, is shortlived, and comes abruptly to an end. The expression is used with a touch of irony. There is no need to correct the text (see phil. n.).—*Out of the dust another springeth*] the figure of the plant is still maintained. He is not missed: his place is immediately filled by another, just as though he had never been. צָמַח, to *spring up* (as a plant), Gn. 2^{5} etc.; fig. of men, as Is. 44^{4}. עָפָר, *dust*, poet. for the soil forming the surface of the earth, as 5^{6} 14^{8} 28^{2} 30^{6} $41^{25 (33)}$, Is. $2^{19. 19}$. The fall of the godless man, here described, from the height of prosperity to the direst adversity resembles that of Job; and Bildad, though he does not say it in so many words, no doubt desires Job to consider whether his own misfortune may not be due to the same cause.

20–22. But God does not forsake the righteous, not even when he is in adversity, if he only turns to Him for help ($^{5-7}$): if, therefore, Job is really blameless (^{6}), he may rest assured that he will again be blessed with prosperity.

20. *Perfect*] 1^{1} n.—*Taketh not hold*, etc.] to support him: the figure, as Is. 41^{13} 42^{6} al.

21. Development of ^{20a}: happiness is still in store for Job. —*Be filled with laughter*] Ps. 126^{2} אז ימלא שחוק פינו.—*Shouting*] *i.e.* joyous shouting: cp. the cognate vb. in 38^{7}, Is. 44^{23}.

22. Development of ^{20b}: Job's enemies, who delight in his misfortune, will be filled with disappointment when they see

10 Shall not *they* teach thee, and say to thee,
And bring forth words out of their understanding?

"it is the heirs of all the ages who are the 'true ancients,' and each generation adds its own quota to the stock, the former age being less wise than the most recent": this is excellent philosophy, but questionable exegesis. The contrast in Bildad's mind is between modern individuals and the whole past of mankind; and he conveniently forgets, after the manner of traditionalists, that that past, too, was composed of individuals, that the oldest doctrine was once new, and that novelty and antiquity are alike irrelevant as tests of truth.—*Know nothing*] Heb. *and do not know*, the vb. *to know* being used absolutely, as in 34^{2} (where the part. "(Ye) that know," is parallel to "(Ye) wise"), and, negatived as here, Is. 44^{9}, Ps. 73^{22}.—*Because our days . . . are a shadow*] cp. 14^{2}, Ps. 102^{12} 109^{23}, Qoh. 6^{12} 8^{13}, Wis. 2^{5}, all of which passages the present would more closely resemble if we read, *And our days . . . are like a shadow* (וכצל for כי צל: so 𝔖).

10. *They*] the pronoun is independently expressed in the Hebrew, and therefore emphatic.—*Out of their understanding*] as their position in the Hebrew shows, the emphatic words in the clause. Words of *understanding* (לב, *heart*: see on 7^{17}) are theirs, in opposition to the empty ill-considered words of Job (v.^{2}).

11–19. The teaching of the ancients, cast by the poet into his own words, and expressed in imagery, drawn from plant-life, so common in this book, and the fragile spider's web. And first ($^{11-13}$) the rapid ruin of those who forget God, and are deprived of His sustenance and support, is compared to the speedy collapse of some lofty water-reed, when suddenly deprived of water. The allusions to the papyrus and reed-grass, which are for the most part referred to in connection with Egypt, may be due to the poet's knowledge of, or personal acquaintance with, Egypt; but in view of the growth of papyrus (at least in modern times) in the Jordan valley, and of the references to papyrus in Is. 35^{7} (if the text may be trusted) and (probably) to the reed-grass in Hos. 13^{15}, this is not certain.

11 Will the papyrus rise up proudly without mire?
Will the reed-grass grow without water?
12 Whilst it is yet in its greenness, without being cut down,
Before any other herb it withereth.
13 So is the ⌜end⌝ of all that forget God;
And the hope of the godless man perisheth:
14 Whose confidence is cut off,
And whose trust is a spider's web.

---

11. *Papyrus*] Hebrew *gōmeʾ*, Ex. 2^{3}, Is. 18^{2} 35^{7} †. A tall reed, consisting of a bare stem, ten feet or more in height with a large tuft of leaves and flowers at the top (see illustration in Tristram, *NHB* 434, or *EBi.* 3557), abundant in ancient Egypt, but now extinct there and found only on the banks of the "Blue" and "White" Nile. It also grows in the Jordan valley, especially in the Ḥuleh swamps (Post in *DB* iv. 212^{b}).—*Mire*] or *swampy ground*: בִּצָּה, 40^{21} (EVV. *fen*), Ezk. 47^{11} † (*miry place*); cf. בֹּץ, Jer. 38^{22} †.—*Reed-grass*] Heb. *'āḥū*, Egypt. *aḥu* (from *aḥa*, to be green): so Gn. $41^{2.18}$ † (+ according to some, Hos. 13^{15}); and in the form ἄχει in 𝔊 Gn. $41^{2.3.18.19}$, Is. 19^{7}, Sir 40^{16}; and Θ Jb. 8^{11}. See, further, *EBi.* 1532*f.*

12. *His greenness*] cf. Ct. 6^{11} † אִבֵּי הנחל, the *fresh*, *green shoots* of the wādy; and the Aram. אִנְבָּא, *fruit*, Dn. $4^{9.11.18\,(12.14.21)}$ †; in 𝔗 אִבָּא, Gn. 3^{6} al.—*It withereth*] in its full luxuriance, without being cut off, merely by the withdrawal of its water.

13. Such is the fate of those that forget God.—*The end*] as ^{7}. 𝔐 has *the paths* (ארחות); but "end" (𝔊) is much more suitable: so Me. Bi. Sgf. Gr. Bu. Klo. Du.—*The godless man*] Heb. *ḥānēf*: Jb. 8^{13} 13^{16} 15^{34} 17^{8} 20^{5} 27^{8} 34^{30} 36^{13}; elsewhere only Is. $9^{16(17)}$ 10^{6} 33^{14}, Ps. 35^{16}, Pr. 11^{9} †, with derivatives in Is. 32^{6}, Jer. 23^{15} †. The cognate verb means to *be profane*, Jer. 23^{11}, or polluted, especially by bloodshed, idolatry, or other grave offence, Is. 24^{5}, Jer. 3^{1} al. With ^{b}, cf. Pr. 10^{28} "*and the hope* of the wicked *perisheth*."

14. Whatever he relies upon to secure his position, and protect him against ruin, fails him. Line ^{a} slightly emended, to the great improvement of the parallelism, reads: "Whose

him again prosperous; and disaster will overtake the wicked. Bildad's last words are double-edged. On the one hand, in so far as he seems to identify Job's enemies with the wicked, he implies that he does not class Job among them; on the other hand, the last line suggests ominously that it is just Job's tent which is already no more.—*Clothe themselves with shame*] the figure, as Ps. 35^{26} 109^{29} (כְּלִמָּה) 132^{16}.—*The tent*] 5^{24}.

IX. X. Job's reply to Bildad's first speech.—Though there is no unambiguous address to Bildad in particular, or to the three friends together (ct. 6^{22-29}), 9^{1-24} may be regarded as the direct reply to Bildad, opening, as it does, with reference to Bildad's opening words, and in $^{22-24}$ giving direct contradiction to his closing words in 8^{20-22}. But in the remainder of the speech Job, disregarding the friends (as in the latter part of his previous speech, c. 7), is rather musing to himself on God's mysterious ways ($9^{25f. 32-35}$), and considering how he will question Him ($10^{2ff.}$), or directly addressing himself to God (9^{28b-31}). In the direct reply Job takes up Bildad's conception of the divine might and justice. Certainly God is irresistible in His might (9^{4-13}): if, then, to be almighty (cp. 8^3 n.) is to be just, if justice is whatever an almighty being may do, God is just ($9^{2f.}$), and certainly, if He insists on holding Job to be guilty, Job cannot establish his innocence over against Him (9^{14-21}). On the other hand, Bildad is quite wrong in maintaining (8^{20-22}) that God's might or justice was discriminative; it is not: for innocent and guilty alike go down before it (9^{22-24}). In the remainder of his speech Job muses on the brevity of life (9^{25-27} 10^{20-22}), on the futility of attempting to establish his innocence against God's determination to hold him guilty and treat him with severity (9^{29-35}), and on the apparent contradictoriness of God's actions in thus treating him ($10^{5-7. 14-17}$), after having lavished such care on him both before ($^{8-11}$) and after (^{12}) birth. Why did He bring him into life ($10^{18f.}$)? Why cannot He at least leave him alone for the few days of life that remain ($^{20-22}$)?

IX. 2-4. Job ironically concedes Bildad's position (8^3) that God never acts unjustly, and consequently whatever He does is right: man is powerless before Him; what chance has he to prove himself innocent, when God, who sets Himself the

IX. 1 And Job answered and said,
2 Of a truth I know that it is so:
And how can a man be just with God?
3 If he were to desire to dispute with him,
He could not answer him one of a thousand.
4 Wise in heart, and mighty in strength—
Who (ever) hardened (himself) against him, and prospered?

---

standard of righteousness, and is irresponsible and omnipotent, is resolved to prove him guilty?

2. *Of a truth*] ironically, as 12^{2}.—*That it is so*] what Bildad has said (8^{3}).—*And how*, etc.] Eliphaz's principle (4^{17}), with the change of מִן into עִם—perhaps (Dr.) to suggest the double sense, "How can man be just *in the estimation of* (עִם, *with*, as 1 S. 2^{26}, 2 S. 6^{22}) God?" and "How can man have right (in a contest) *with* God?" For עִם, *with*, suggesting *in a contest with*, cf. $^{3.14}$ 10^{17b} 16^{21}, Ps. 94^{16} מי יקום לי עם מרעים.

3–4. If man did wish to contend with God, for the purpose of establishing his righteousness, he would be foredoomed to failure, he could not answer Him one of the innumerable questions which, in His infinite superiority to man, He would put to him: His wisdom, combined with His might (^{4a}—a summary anticipation of $^{5ff.}$: cp. also ^{19}, Is. 40^{26}), would bring about his complete discomfiture. A less probable view of ^{4a} is that it goes with "who" in ^{b}—who, however great and strong, hardened himself, etc. (Olsh. Ehrlich).

4. *In heart*] in *intellect*, 7^{17} n.—*Hardened* (himself) *against him*] probably with an ellipse, *hardened* (his neck) *against him*, *i.e.* (Da.) *braved him*: cf. Dt. 10^{16}, Jer. 7^{26}, Pr. 29^{1} (vb.), Ex. 32^{9} (adj.) al. Possible also is an ellipse, as perhaps in Ex. 13^{15}, of heart (Ps. 95^{8}, Pr. 28^{14}) or spirit (Dt. 2^{30}).—*And prospered*] or, more exactly, *was* (came off) *whole* (8^{6} n.), *i.e.* safe and sound.

5–10. Description of God's omnipotence as manifested in the mighty works of nature. Cf. the picture drawn by Eliphaz, 5^{9-16}, who, however, in agreement with his line of argument, selects examples of the *beneficent* operations of God, whereas

5 Who removeth the mountains, and they know it not,
Who overturneth them in his anger:
6 Who shaketh the earth out of her place,
And the pillars thereof tremble:
7 Who commandeth the sun, and it beameth not;
And sealeth up the stars:

Job selects examples illustrating His unlimited and even irresponsible and destructive *power*.

5. A hyperbolical description of the dislodgment of huge masses of rock from a mountain, either by an earthquake or, in a thunderstorm, by lightning, or of great boulders being rolled down the gullies by the torrents of water which in a storm rapidly fill them (as may be witnessed sometimes in the Sinaitic Peninsula; see "Neh.-Mal." in the *Century Bible*, p. 99 f.).—*And they know it not*] so quickly is it done: cf. (for the meaning of the expression) Ps. 35^{8}, Is. 47^{11}, Pr. 5^{6}, Jer. 50^{24}. Or, to obtain a closer parallel with the last part of [b], reading the vb. in the sing., with God as the subj., Who removeth mountains *without knowing it*, so easily and without effort does He act.

6. Earthquakes. The description is again hyperbolical. The earth was supposed to be supported upon massive pillars: cf. 38^{6}, 1 S. 2^{8}, Ps. 104^{5} (ct. 26^{7}: see n.). Or the pillars of the earth may be identical with what in 26^{11} are called the pillars of heaven: *i.e.* the mountains rising from the horizon on earth and supporting heaven.

7. Abnormal obscurations of the heavens, whether caused by heavy thunderstorms, or by sandstorms (see Dr. on Ex. 10^{23}), or eclipses.—*Beameth not*] The word is the one regularly used of the sun's "rising": but its proper meaning is to *beam* or *shine forth*; and it is not confined to the literal rising of the sun (cf. Is. 58^{10}).

8–10. Regarded by some as an insertion: see phil. notes. Note [8a] = Is. 44^{24d} (cp. Is. 40^{22b}, Ps. 104^{2}); [b] cp. Mic. 1^{3b}; [9] cp. Am. 5^{8}; [10] = 5^{9}.

8–9. God's power, as shown in the workmanship of heaven, and ([8b]) in His sovereign control of the billows of the sea.

8 Who alone stretched out the heavens,
And treadeth upon the waves of the sea:
9 Who made the Bear (and) Orion,
And the Pleiades, and the chambers of the south:

---

8. *Treadeth*, etc.] Viz. in a tempest, when the *waves* (Heb. "high places") rise mountain-high, and Yahweh was supposed to walk on their crest. Elsewhere Yahweh is described as treading, or marching, on the "high places" of the earth (Am. 4^{13}, Mic. 1^{3}). The expression implies undisputed possession of, or uncontrolled sovereignty over: cf. (of Israel in Canaan) Dt. 32^{13} 33^{29}, Is. 58^{14}; also Ps. $18^{34(33)}$, Hab. 3^{19}.

9. Three constellations, which, though the ancients were completely unaware of their gigantic size, impressed them by their brilliancy and magnificence, as they glowed in the nocturnal heavens. The identifications are not certain: see more fully on $38^{31f.}$, Del. and Di. here and on $38^{31f.}$, *EBi.* s.v. *Stars*, § 3 (Burney).—*The Bear*] Heb. *'āsh*, in 38^{32} † spelt more correctly *'ayish*, though (as Syriac shows) *'iyyūsh* would be the best pronunciation. In 38^{31} the reference is to 'Ayish and her children, the children, if the identification with the Bear be correct, being presumably the three stars of the tail. But, on account of its greater meteorological significance (cp. 38^{22-31}), the Pleiades have been thought to be the constellation invoked, 'Ayish being strictly the principal star of the group (Alcyone), the remainder her children.—*Orion*] 38^{31}, Am. 5^{8}; and in the pl. Is. 13^{10} †, "For the stars of the heavens and *their Orions*—*i.e.* their constellations like Orion—shall not give their light," etc. The Heb. is כְּסִיל, the common word for *fool* (Pr. $1^{22.32}$ etc.): c. 38^{31} speaks of the "bands" of Orion: as Orion was supposed by the ancient Greeks to be a giant bound in the heavens by chains, it is difficult not to think that some similar idea underlay the Heb. name, and that there was some legend of a giant who, confiding foolishly in his strength, and defying the Almighty, was, as a punishment for his arrogance, bound for ever in the sky. The identification of כסיל with Orion is as ancient as 𝔊 38^{31}, Is. 13^{10}, and is generally accepted. Saad. and some others identify it with Canopus.—*The Pleiades*] 38^{31}, Am. 5^{8} †. If the first-named

10 Who doeth great things past finding out;
Yea, marvellous things without number.

---

constellation be rightly identified with the Pleiades, that now named (כימה) must be something else—possibly Sirius. The Bear, Orion, and the Pleiades attracted notice at an early period among the Greeks also, partly, perhaps, on account of their conspicuousness, and partly because their risings and settings with the sun marked the seasons. Comp. Hom. *Il.* 18. 483–9 (as depicted on the shield of Achilles):

Ἐν μὲν γαῖαν ἔτευξ', ἐν δ' οὐρανόν, ἐν δὲ θάλασσαν,
Ἠέλιόν δ' ἀκάμαντα, Σελήνην τε πλήθουσαν,
ἐν δὲ τὰ τείρεα πάντα, τά τ' οὐρανὸς ἐστεφάνωται,
Πληϊάδας θ' Ὑάδας τε, τό τε σθένος Ὠρίωνος,
Ἄρκτον θ', ἣν καὶ ἄμαξαν ἐπίκλησιν καλέουσιν,
ἥ τ' αὐτοῦ στρέφεται, καί τ' Ὠρίωνα δοκεύει,
οἴη δ' ἄμμορός ἐστι λοετρῶν Ὠκεανοῖο.

Od. v. 272–5 (Ulysses sitting by the helm, sleepless—*Πληϊάδας τ' ἐσορῶντι καὶ ὀψὲ δύοντα Βοώτην Ἄρκτον θ', κτλ.*—as in the three lines just quoted). *Il.* 22. 27–31 (Achilles in his flashing armour compared to the dog-star):

ὅς ῥά τ' ὀπώρης εἶσιν, ἀρίζηλοι δέ οἱ αὐγαὶ
φαίνονται πολλοῖσι μετ' ἄστρασι νυκτὸς ἀμολγῷ·
ὅν τε κύν' Ὠρίωνος ἐπίκλησιν καλέουσι·
λαμπρότατος μὲν ὅδ' ἐστί, κακὸν δέ τε σῆμα τέτυκται,
καί τε φέρει πολλὸν πυρετὸν δειλοῖσι βροτοῖσιν.

The chambers of the south] this translation of the Hebrew phrase assumes an unusual orthography (תמן for תימן), but is more probable than the alternative *the chambers of the Twins* (תמן = תְּאֹמָן, Aramaic pl. for תְּאֹמִים). But the chambers of the south can hardly refer to a single particular constellation, though in the context it would be most natural to look for this; if the text and translation are correct, the term probably refers to constellations which, as the poet knew, appeared above the horizon as a traveller journeyed south (Dr.). Less probable in the context would be the identification with "the storehouses of elemental forces, such as the storm, or light and darkness: cp. 37^{9} 38^{22}" (Peake). Hoffm. by a slight emendation (חדר ותימן

11 Lo, he goeth by me, and I see him not:
He passeth on also, but I perceive him not.
12 If he seizeth, who can turn him back?
Who can say unto him, What doest thou?
13 God doth not turn back his anger;
The helpers of Rahab did stoop under him.

---

for 'חדרי ח) obtains the names of two constellations—*Ḥdr* and the Twins.

10. Repeated almost *verbatim* from 5^{9} (Eliphaz).

11–24. From the general truth that man cannot establish his right in a conflict with God ($^{2f.}$), whose might is overwhelming ($^{4-10}$), Job passes ($^{11-13}$) to its special application to himself, and, in particular, first on the supposition that God summons Job to answer a charge ($^{14.\,15}$), and then on the supposition that Job summons God ($^{16-20}$); in either event he would be overwhelmed by God's might, terrorized into not maintaining, but at best supplicating for, his right (^{15}), or, having summoned God, to charge not Him, but himself, with wrong (^{20}). And so he returns to generalization: God destroys men indifferently, whether they are actually good men or bad men (^{22}), or, if He discriminates, it is in favour of the wicked (^{24}).

11. Job, like the mountains (^{5}), lay in the path of God as He passed along in His anger; and though He passed invisibly, Job knows that He has passed by the effect of His passage; like mountains overturned by the same cause, Job's life lies in ruins. Instead of directly stating this fact, Job speaks quasi-hypothetically (see phil. n.), but only in order to suggest the more strongly the divine origin and, therefore, the irreparableness of his ruin, and the impossibility of withstanding or questioning God's action ($^{12-14}$).

12. Cp. 11^{10} 23^{13}.

13. Man cannot (^{12}), and God Himself (emphatic), who might (and, as others thought, often did, Ps. 78^{38}), does not, turn back His anger; the only thing to do then, as the mighty beings of ancient story found, was to sink down under Him as He passed along. The anger of God does not appear to Job as it did to the prophets (*e.g.* Is. 9^{11} etc.), to be provoked or maintained in

action by human sin: it is ethically uncontrolled, sheer power in action, destroying things and men indifferently, whether mighty mountains, or frail though innocent men like Job, who come in its way. The conception has its parallel in early popular thought of Yahweh (see, *e.g.*, 2 S. $6^{6ff.}$), which left its mark even on much later theology; see, especially in P, Nu. 1^{53} 17^{11} 18^{5} (see nn. on those passages in *ICC*, and also on Nu. 22^{32}); but Job rather heightens the picture of man's helplessness in a world subject to God's anger: popular thought pictured that anger aroused by man's intrusion, however unwilling and involuntary, on what was holy or sacred to God; Job thinks of man passively and helplessly exposed to that anger, if God merely happens to come his way.—*The helpers of Rahab*] Rahab, meaning boisterousness, arrogancy, and perhaps overbearingness (cp. Is. 3^{5} and n. on Is. 14^{4}), is, apparently, a popular name given in Hebrew folklore to the sea-monster (תנין, 7^{12}), who in primæval times (Is. 51^{9}) had defied, but been vanquished by, Yahweh (26^{12}, where Rahab is ‖ to the sea; Is. 51^{9}, ‖ תנין, Ps. 89^{11}: cp. Is. 30^{7}?). In. Ps. 87^{4} Rahab is employed as a name for Egypt, which country in the person of its king is addressed elsewhere as: "Thou great monster (התנין) which lieth in the midst of its streams (יאריו), who saith, Mine is the Nile (יאר), and *I* made it" (Ezk. 29^{3}). This sea-monster of Hebrew popular story is obviously derived from the Tiâmat (philologically = Heb. *thôm, the abyss*) of the Babylonian myth, the great dragon representing the sea and the forces of disorder, which were vanquished by Marduk before Creation. The *helpers of Rahab* come from the same source: in Tablet IV. lines 105 ff. of *Enuma Elish* (L. King, *The Seven Tablets of Creation*; Rogers, *CP*), Marduk, after slaying Tiâmat, deals with her helpers:

When he had slain Tiâmat, the leader,
Her power was broken, her army was scattered
And the gods, *her helpers*, who marched at her side,
Trembled and were afraid and turned back.
They broke away to save their lives,
But they were surrounded, they could not escape.
He took them captive, he broke their weapons,
In the net they were thrown, and in the snare they remained.

14 How much less shall *I* answer him,
    And choose out my words (to reason) with him?
15 Whom, though I were righteous, I could not answer;
    I should make supplication to mine adversary.
16 If I had cited (him), and he had answered me;
    I should not believe that he would give ear unto my voice

---

. . . The world they filled with cries of sorrow,
They bore his punishment, they are shut up in prison
(Rogers' translation).

In Ps. 89[11] these helpers are referred to, in parallelism with Rahab, as Yahweh's enemies.

14. *Answer him*] rebut the charge brought against me by God, who is here represented as Job's opponent-at-law. So [b] means: how incapable should I be of selecting a successful line of defence in my conflict with (עם, as [3]: see n. on [2]) Him in the law court.

15. Though his case were perfectly good, with such an opponent, he could not so argue as to get a decision on its merits; he could at best cast himself on the favour of his adversary (= opponent-at-law: see phil. n.), with a view to obtaining as a favour what was really his by right.

16–18. Even though Job were to summon God to answer a charge (cp. 13[22b]), and God were to appear in court in response to the summons, yet God would by violent methods ([17f.]) in court prevent him from formulating his just charge against Him.

16. *Cited* (*him*)] Heb. *called*, קרא being used of a legal summons as in Is. 59[4] (|| נשפט).—*Answered*] *i.e.* appeared in response to the summons, so rather similarly 5[1], where appearance in response to Job's call, not a speech in reply, is intended. Du., understanding *answer* in the sense of speech in reply, reads "he would not answer me" (after $\mathfrak{G}^{B}$) to harmonize [a] on this view with [b]: see phil. n.

17 f. The vbs. describe what would be God's conduct in court, if He were to appear there; but if $\mathfrak{G}^{B}$ be followed in [16] they describe God's present actual treatment of Job: then render (Hi. Du., and in [17] RV.): *bruiseth*, *multiplieth*, *suffereth me not*, and *satiateth*; in this case with [18a], cp. 7[19b], and with [18b], 13[26].

17 For he would bruise me with a tempest,
And multiply my wounds without cause.
18 He would not suffer me to take my breath,
But would satiate me with bitterness.
19 If (it be a question) of the strength of the mighty, "Here [I am]!" (saith he);
And if of judgment (he saith), "Who will appoint me a time?"
20 Though I were righteous, mine own mouth would condemn me;
I am perfect; and he declares me crooked!

---

17. *Bruise*] see phil. n.—*Tempest*] cp. 38^1 40^6; and see phil. n. Hi. gives the word (שערה) the meaning of *hair* (cp. 𝔗: see phil. n.) as in 4^{15}, and renders ^{17a}: who drags me by the hair (cp. 16^{12}). But the sing. of the noun would be as questionable here as in 4^{15}, and the vb. does not mean *to drag*.—b. Cp. 2^3.

19. "God's might is such that he is ready for any contest, and superior to the summons of any judge" (Dr.). See, further, phil. n.—*Appoint me a time*] the Hif. (Jer. $49^{19} = 50^{44\dagger}$) of the vb. used in c. 2^{11} (n.): the meaning here is: Fix the day on which I must appear to be judged.

20. *Righteous . . . condemn*] the second vb. is the declarative Hif. (G–K. 53*c*) of רשע (the antithesis of צדק, *righteous*), and means *would declare*, or *pronounce*, *unrighteous*. Primarily both the vb. and adj. of צדק and רשע mean right or wrong in a particular case, innocent or guilty of a particular charge (cp. *e.g.* Dt. 25^1: judges are to "pronounce the innocent innocent, and the guilty guilty": EV. renders badly); and here, with the prevailing figure of the law courts, we might render: though I were in the right, mine own mouth would pronounce me in the wrong. But the implied charge here is so general (cp. ^{b}), that there is no substantial difference in this particular case (ct. Dt. 25^1) between the two renderings, *in the right* and *righteous*.—*Mine own mouth . . . he*] the parallelism would be more exact, if we read *his mouth* (but see phil. n.) in ^{a}, or (better) treated "mouth" not "God" as the subj. in ^{b}, rendering "it declares."—*Perfect . . . crooked*] see 1^1 n.

21 I am perfect; I care not for myself;
I refuse my life.
22 It is (all) one; therefore I say,
The perfect and the wicked he bringeth to an end!
23 If the scourge slay suddenly,
He mocketh at the trial of the innocent.

21, 22. A succession of short clauses giving a verse structure very different from the normal: this is perhaps original and intentional (Bu.), to give effect in form to the emotional contents of the vv. For a reconstruction of the text, see phil. n. The vindication of his integrity is all that Job any longer cares about; life he is quite ready to hazard; it is all one to him whether he lives or dies: consequently he can and will speak, and freely (cp. 13^{13}): God may slay the wicked, as Bildad had asserted ($8^{11ff.}$), but He also slays and so rejects the good, which Bildad had denied (8^{20}); and so in reality by His undiscriminating action He perverts justice, which also Bildad had denied (8^{3}).

21. *I am perfect*] perhaps merely an accidental repetition from ^{20} (Be.^{K}).—*I care not for myself*] Heb. I know (אדע) not my soul (*i.e.* myself: ‖ "my life"), the vb. being used, as not infrequently, in the sense of caring, troubling about a thing: cp. Gn. 39^{6}, Dt. 33^{9}.—*I refuse my life*] cp. 7^{16}, and see phil. n. there.

22. *It is all one*] 𝔊 omits. 𝔗 *it is one measure, i.e.* good and bad are requited alike (cp. Qoh. 9^{2}), so Del.[1] (but not [2]) and Ehrlich. But the phrase is to be explained with most moderns as above in the n. on $^{21.\,22}$.

23, 24. Examples of God's moral indifference: when the *scourge* of God (cp. Is. 10^{26}) is applied in the form of some plague that suddenly carries men off by the thousands, the innocent die as well as the wicked, and God shows Himself more than quietly indifferent to their fate: He *mocks at* (cp. Ps. 2^{4}) their *trial*, or *despair* (see phil. n.). Again, the government is in the hands of godless men; judges have been blinded so that they do not see the right, or perhaps, having been bribed, they deliberately overlook the right of the

24 The earth is given into the hand of the wicked:
He covereth the faces of the judges thereof;
If not, then, who is it?

---

innocent; in such social and political conditions the innocent come to an end at least as often as the wicked: indeed, the wicked is uppermost. Yet who is responsible for this, if not God (^{24c})? therefore God discriminates, if at all, against the innocent.

24. *The earth*] or possibly *a land*, *i.e.* a province. On the former view, cp. with *the judges thereof*, Ps. 2^{10} "judges of the earth" || to "kings." In either case the writer may have had in view the government and administration of some world empire of which Judah formed at the time a province: pagans ruled, pious, innocent Jews suffered.—*Is given*] or, pointing differently: He, *i.e.* God, hath given it. 𝔊 omits $^{b.\,c}$, and the words "it is (all) one" in ^{22}—probably to soften down the strong expressions in $^{20-24}$: cp. 𝔊's substitution of "great" for "innocent" in ^{22b}.

25–35. Having completed his reply to Bildad with a direct contradiction of Bildad's contention, Job, musing now to himself, bemoans the brevity of his life (cp. $7^{6ff.}$), and the impossibility of any alleviation of his distress while God retains His present attitude, the impossibility, too, of establishing his innocence so long as God is bent on besmirching ($^{30f.}$) him; but if God would change His attitude and cease to overbear him with His terrible might, then Job would establish the integrity of which he is conscious (v.$^{34f.}$). The lament over the brevity and near end of his life follows immediately on his expression of readiness to have done with it in $^{21f.}$: cp. conversely $7^{15ff.}$ after $7^{6f.}$.

25 f. The speed with which his brief life is hurrying to its goal, Job illustrates by three finely varied and very suggestive figures, ^{25a} that of the solitary runner (רץ) making all haste to deliver his message (cp. 2 S. 18^{22-24}), ^{26a} that of the fragile craft of reeds (see phil. n.) that skim so swiftly over the surface of the Nile—another indication of the poet's acquaintance with Egypt (cp. 8^{11} n.), and ^{26b} that of a griffon swooping down on its prey.

25 And my days are swifter than a post:
They flee away, they see no good.
26 They shoot along like skiffs of reed,
Like an eagle that swoopeth on the prey.
27 If I say, "I will forget my complaint,
I will put off my (sad) countenance, and brighten up":
28 I dread all my pains;
I know that thou wilt not hold me innocent.

---

25. *And my days*] the *and* is better omitted, with 2 MSS, 𝔖𝔙: cp. 7^{6}.—*Flee . . . see*] or *have fled . . . have seen*: the terms are pf.: so in ^{26a}. In $7^{6b.\,7b}$ Job had no hope of any further sight of prosperity: here his present calamities have blotted out his memory of the prosperity that he had seen.

26. *An eagle*] strictly a *vulture*, a *griffon-vulture*: see Tristram, *NHB* 172 ff.; Dr. on Dt. 14^{12} 32^{11}; *EBi.*, *s.v.* Eagle: though Post in *DB* (cp. *Lex. s.v.* נשׁר) claims that the Heb. *nesher*, like the Arabic *nisr*, might include eagles as well as vultures. In any case, the Hebrew associations with the word *nesher* were unlike the English associations with vultures; for though the *nesher's* habit of feeding on carrion was of course known, and is sometimes referred to (39^{30}; cp. Mt. 24^{28} *ἀετοί* = Pesch. ܢܫܪ̈ܐ), it is most commonly mentioned in the OT. in nobler comparisons; see, *e.g.*, Ex. 19^{4}, Dt. 32^{11}, Is. 40^{31}. Its swiftness, the point of comparison here, is frequently mentioned: see Hab. 1^{8} (swift on the prey, as here), 2 S. 1^{23}, Jer. 4^{13}, La. 4^{19}.

27a. Cp. 7^{13b}.—*Complaint*] (sad) musing, and the expression of it in words (see phil. n. on 7^{11}): the whole phrase is nearly equivalent to our "I will forget my thoughts."—*Put off my countenance*] this curious expression has a close parallel in 1 S. 1^{18} 𝔐 (not 𝔊): "her (sad) countenance was no more hers"; in Gn. $31^{2.\,5}$ the expressions are much less similar.—*Brighten up*] 10^{20}: see phil. n.

28a. Cp. 7^{15}. **b.** The pains (^{a}) will continue, for God is bent on regarding Job as not innocent, and, therefore, on afflicting him as ^{29a} one guilty.

29 I am to be guilty!
    Why then do I labour in vain?
30 If I wash myself with snow,
    And cleanse my hands with lye;
31 Then thou wilt plunge me in the ditch,
    And mine own clothes shall abhor me.
32 For (he is) not a man, as I am, that I should answer him,
    That we should come together in judgment.
33 There is no umpire betwixt us,
    That might lay his hand upon us both.

---

29. If, whatever happens, Job must endure the sufferings of the guilty (^{28}); if, as often as he clears himself, God fastens on him afresh the false charge of guilt—this point being expressed by the figure of a man cleansing himself in the most thorough manner possible only to be flung back by one stronger into a filthy, stinking ditch ($^{30f.}$)—what use is there in any further attempt to clear himself (^{29b})?

30. *With snow*] regarded not unnaturally, though erroneously, as more cleansing than water. Me. *As snow* (cp. Is. 1^{18}) —כמו for במו.—*Lye*] alkali, obtained from the ashes of plants and used for cleansing the person; בר in this sense only here and Is. 1^{25} (?); cp. ברית, Jer. 2^{22}, Mal. 3^{2}. The parallelism strongly favours giving בר this sense here (so 𝔗 and most moderns; 𝔖 took it in the sense of *cleanness*, as in 22^{30}, 2 S. 22^{21}).

31. The moment he has finished washing, before he has dressed again, God plunges him in the filthy mire; when he issues from it his very clothes regard him as an abomination to be kept at a distance (cp. 30^{10}, Ps. $88^{9\,(8)}$), and so refuse to cover him. Some (Ew. al.), finding this powerful personification too strong or strange, think of Job as having been dipped in the filth clothed, and render (cp. Ezk. 16^{25}): my clothes make me an abomination (to others): others (see phil. n.) emend "clothes" into "friends" (then cp. Ps. 88^{9}).

32. A just decision is impossible to obtain: for Job is human, God is not, and therefore Job cannot reply to (cp. $^{14f.}$) God's charge.

33. Nor is there any one superior to them both to pronounce

34 Let him take away his rod from me,
And let not his terror affright me:
35 Then would I speak, and not fear him.
For not so am I with myself.

---

a decision and arbitrate between them.—*There is no*] so 𝔐: 𝔐 might also be rendered: *Would that there were an*; but see phil. n.—*Umpire*] מוכיח is here one who gives a decision in a dispute between two parties: cp. the use of the vb. in Gn. 31^{37} and Is. 2^{4} (Yahweh will arbitrate in the disputes arising among many nations).—*Lay his hand upon*] exercise authority and control over: cp. Ps. 139^{5}.

34 f. But let God meet Job on equal terms, not taking advantage of His irresistible might to beat him and terrify him into silence, and Job will freely utter his conviction of his own innocence, and, consequently, of the injustice of God's present violent treatment of him.

34. See 13^{21} 33^{7}.

35. *Not so . . . with myself*] I am aware of nothing to make me afraid of Him, if He acts not in might, but in right: *with*, as 10^{13} 15^{9} 23^{14} 27^{11}.

X. And yet, whether God remove His rod and His terrors (9^{34}) or not, since Job is sick of life (^{1a}) and has, therefore, nothing more to fear (cp. $7^{15f.}$ $9^{21f.}$), he will speak out his thoughts freely ($^{1b.\,c}$), and unreservedly interrogate God as to the reason of His contention with him ($^{2.\,6f.}$); he asks God whether the reasons that occur to him, and yet seem so insufficient or irrelevant, are really the reasons: (1) Does God get any benefit or pleasure out of ill-treating and rejecting a life that has cost Him much labour to produce (^{3})? (2) Is God after all of limited vision and perception like men, so that He judges Job wrongly, and contends with him because He really has concluded that Job deserves the treatment (^{4})? or (3) Is God after all shortlived like men, so that He is in a hurry to seek out Job's sin before it has been committed (^{5})? Of these questions (2) and (3) are no further considered, perhaps because the answers to them are too obvious: God cannot see amiss and cannot die; but the various elements in (1) are elaborated in $^{8-22}$, viz. the pains

X. [1] My soul loatheth my life;
I will let my complaint take its course upon me;
I will speak in the bitterness of my soul.
[2] I will say unto God, Do not condemn me;
Make me to know wherefore thou contendest with me?
[3] Is it good for thee that thou oppressest,
That thou rejectest the work of thine hands,
And that thou shinest upon the counsel of the wicked?

---

taken by God to produce Job ($^{8-12}$), and, in spite of this, His vigilant and persistent hostility to Job ($^{13-17}$), and the question itself; why so strange a combination, why not, at least for the few days that remain to Job, leave him alone ($^{18-22}$)? The transitions of thought at the beginning of the chapter are not too clearly marked: in particular, the precise point of ^{5} is rather uncertain, whether interpreted as above or otherwise, and ^{6} would follow more easily as an alternative presentation of the case to ^{8b} than as the conclusion to ^{5}. Du. omits ^{5}; possibly, if we omit at all to recover an easier connection, it would be better to omit $^{3c-6}$.

1. To avoid a tristich Bi. Du. omit ^{c} as a variation on 7^{11}; but of the three lines $^{b.\ c}$ are the better parallels; if omission were required ^{1a} (a variation of 9^{21}) could be better spared.—*Complaint*] musing; 9^{27} n.—*Let . . . take its course*] Job will no longer keep his musings to himself (cp. 7^{11}), but let them loose: עזב, as 20^{13} (antithetical to מנע, *to hold back*), Ex. 23^{5}, and in the proverbial expression עצור ועזוב, *shut up or let loose*, *e.g.* Dt. 32^{36}.—*Upon me*] as $30^{2.\ 16}$ 14^{22b}, Ps. $42^{6\ (5)}$ al.: see *Lex.* 753*b*.

2. *Do not condemn me*] without formulating the charge (cp. ^{b}), or giving me the opportunity to rebut it.

3. *Is it good for thee*] *i.e.* advantageous to Thee: so Ex. 14^{12}, Nu. 14^{3}, Jg. 9^{2}.—*That thou oppressest*] 𝔊 ἐὰν ἀδικήσω (= ארשע), *if I am guilty* (cp. Ps. 51^{6}), is not preferable to 𝔐.—*The work of thy hands*] *the product of the toil* (יגיע) *of thy hands*, different from the phrase מעשה כפים, commonly so rendered (see phil. n.). By this phrase, which he elaborates in $^{8-11}$, Job refers to himself: but it is of course equally applicable

4 Hast thou eyes of flesh,
Or seest thou as man seeth?
5 Are thy days as the days of man,
Or thy years as man's days,
6 That thou seekest after mine iniquity,
And searchest after my sin,

---

to any man, righteous or wicked, so that the antithesis in [c] is rather lame, and [c] should perhaps be omitted (Bu. al.) and the v. reduced to a distich.

4. The supposition, if it could be entertained, might explain the present facts; but it cannot, for, though men sometimes act in disregard of the fact, it was a commonplace that God was spirit and not flesh (Is. 31[3]), and did not see with limited human vision (1 S. 16[7]).

5. Another supposition that merely needs to be stated to be rejected; for God's years have no end (Ps. 102[28]).—*Man . . . man's*] different words in 𝔐 (גבר . . . אנוש); on the other hand, *days* is repeated, perhaps owing to an accidental replacement in [b] of *days* for *years*: cp. phil. n. on 8[3]. The point of the question has been differently taken: either, is God shortlived, and, therefore, limited in experience like men? in this case [5] is a variation of the thought of [4]; or, is God so shortlived that He must make haste to achieve what He has set before Him before His years come to an end? In neither case does the question fit very naturally into the context: see above on [1ff.].

6. *That*] or, I put these questions, *for* (Du.).—*Mine iniquity . . . my sin*] sin not yet committed by Job, but which God by the infliction of severe suffering is, after the manner of an inquisitor, seeking to compel Job to acknowledge, and thereby give a ground for God's condemnation of him (Del. Di. Dr.); or, iniquity and sin such as Job admitted (7[21]), while refusing to admit "wickedness" ([7a]) such as would justify the *severity* of God's treatment of him: "the fact of guilt he does not deny, but he cannot regard it as of primary importance: if God is regarded as a petty criminal judge, He is degraded to the (merely) human, and it is forgotten that He is the Creator, and

7 Although thou knowest that I am not wicked;
And there is none that can deliver out of thine hand?
8 Thine hands have fashioned and formed me,
⌜Afterwards thou turnest⌝, and destroyest me!
9 Remember, I beseech thee, that thou hast formed me as clay;
And wilt thou bring me into dust again?

---

that man is not a stranger to Him, as the criminal to the judge, but a work of His own hands lovingly produced" (Du.).

7. The two lines express two very disparate ideas, and form very awkward parallels; [a] seems most congruous with the context, and Be. Du. (see phil. n.), by a slight emendation, bring [b] into parallelism with it, rendering, And that there is no transgression (or, treachery) in my hand. Ehrlich, by an even slighter emendation (אִוָּשֵׁעַ for ארשע in [a]), brings [a] into parallelism with [b]: in this case render:

Because Thou knowest that I cannot save myself,
And that there is none that can deliver out of thy hand.

8–11. Amplification of [3]. By a variety of metaphors, or comparisons with human handiwork, the poet emphasizes the care lavished by God on the production of Job.

8. *Fashioned*] like a sculptor.—*Afterwards thou turnest*] see phil. n. 𝔐 EV. *together round about* with [a], giving to the v. an unrhythmical structure.—*Destroyest*] 2^3: Job does not know of the Satanic instigation to God's action.

9. *Formed me as clay*] like a potter; cp. Is. 64^7 45^9. Clay is regarded as the actual material of the human body in 4^{19} 33^6: so some would read here חמר (cp. 𝔊) as an acc. of the material (G–K. 117*hh*) or בחמר (cp. ב in Ex. 38^8: Ehrlich), and render: formed me *out of* clay. Varying the figure the writer repeats the thought of [8]: so much care ([8a. 9a]) expended in vain ([8b. 9b]); has Job been fashioned by the divine sculptor merely, through a change of whim, to be destroyed? has he been formed out of clay into a useful vessel merely to be broken up by the divine potter, and reduced again to meaningless particles of dust? It is true, this line of thought might easily have carried Job to the further point of questioning why man thus made should die at all so as to perish entirely; but since it

10 Didst thou not pour me out like milk,
And curdle me like cheese?
11 Thou didst clothe me with skin and flesh,
And knit me together with bones and sinews.
12 ⌜Favour⌝ and kindness hast thou done with me,
And thy visitation hath preserved my spirit.

---

does not in any case do so in [8], it is ill-advised, on the ground that it does not do so in [9], to subordinate [9b] to "remember" in [a]: Remember that thou bringest men into dust again (Barth), *i.e.* that I am frail (cp. Ps. 103[14]) and mortal: and, then, with Di., to draw the necessary conclusion that [9] with this new, and in itself correct, but between [8] and [10] incongruous thought, is an interpolation.—*Bring . . . into dust again*] cp., of the normal lot of men, Ps. 90[3], Gn. 3[19], and see n. on 1[21].

10, 11. The poet has no thought of the sinfulness of the flesh: the human body is the noble workmanship of God: behind and in the human functions of procreation and gestation lies the activity of God: it was He who poured the milk-like *semen* into the womb, transforming it there into the soft cheese-like substance of the unformed embryo (cp. *παγεὶς ἐν αἵματι*, Wis. 7[2]), clothing this with skin and flesh, and then within the flesh, providing a framework of intertwining (so also Ps. 139[13]) bones (cp. Qoh. 11[5]) and sinews; and so made Job. Cp. Ps. 139[13–16] and, with less detailed reference to the activity of God, 2 Mac. 7[22f.]; or without such reference, Wis. 7[2]. Ct. later, ignobler descriptions of man's (physical) origin (*e.g.* "know whence thou camest: from a fetid drop," מטיפה סרוחה, *Pirke Abhoth*, 3[1]), especially where there is a contrast between the natural man—born of blood, the will of the flesh and the will of man (John 1[13])—and the spiritual man.

11. Might, perhaps, better be subordinated like [10b] to the interrogative in [10a] Didst Thou not pour me out . . . curdle me . . . clothe me . . . knit me . . . ?

12 f. The same care and pains that had been expended on his formation had been continued up through life, betokening, as it seemed, God's kindness to Job; but ([13]) from his recent and present experiences he must conclude that all this was but

13 And (yet) these things didst thou hide in thine heart;
I know that this was in thy thoughts:
14 If I sinned, that thou wouldest mark me,
And wouldest not acquit me from my iniquity;

---

a mask to the real thoughts of God (unfolded in [14–17]), which were not kindly but malignant.—*Favour and kindness*] on the emendation, see phil. n.; or, since alike in rhythm and sense the line would be complete without a second term, we might read simply: Kindness (hast Thou done with me). 𝔐 (EV.) *Life and kindness*; and this has often been taken to refer to birth—having formed my body in the womb, Thou gavest me life when I issued from it. Yet even if 𝔐 is correct, [a. b] alike probably refer not to birth, but to the providence of God protecting and enriching Job throughout his earlier years. *Life* would be, not the beginning of life, the introduction of the life principle at birth, but duration of life, as, *e.g.*, in Ps. 21^{5} 34^{13}, or life as health or welfare; cp. Pr. 4^{22} (Wisdom's words are life unto those that find them, and healing to all their flesh), Mal. 2^{5} (החיים והשלום), Pr. 21^{21} (חיים . . . וכבוד); and with the coupling of *life* and *kindness* (חסד), we might compare the parallelism of life and favour in Pr. 3^{22} (חן), 8^{35} (רצון).—*Thy visitation*] *i.e.* Thy providence. The noun (פקדה) in this sense occurs only here, but it corresponds exactly to the use of the vb. in, *e.g.*, Ps. $8^{5(4)}$ (cp. the ironical expansion of this in Job 7^{18}), Jer. 29^{10}.

13. *These things . . . this*] pointing forward to and explained in [14–17].—*I know*] 9^{28}.—*Was in thy thoughts*] Heb. *was with Thee*: 9^{35} n.

14–17. The secret purposes of God (v.[13]), as Job imagines them.

14. If Job committed any of those sins which man is liable to commit (cp. 7^{21}, v.[6] n.), God would be on the alert that he should not escape punishment for it: there should be no letting of him off even for the least sin.—*Mark*] The same vb. (שמר) as in [12] (*preserve*): for the present nuance, cp. 13^{27}.

15. *Wicked*] The stronger term after *sin* in [14] (cp. [a]), or, rather (cp.[b]), juridically (cp. 9^{20} n.)—alike whether guilty or

15 If I were wicked, (that it would be) woe unto me;
And if I were righteous, that I should not lift up my head,
Being filled with ignominy,
And ⌜sated with⌝ affliction.
16 And if (my head) rose up proudly, (that) thou wouldest hunt me like a lion;
And again show thyself marvellous against me:

---

innocent of any charge you prefer against me, I should suffer. —*Lift up mine head*] cp. "Lift up the face," 11^{15} 22^{26}.—*Filled with*] שבע: cp. 9^{18} ישביעני במרורים.—*Sated with*] See phil. n.; 𝔐 probably means *look upon* (EV. "looking upon"). $^{15c.\,d}$ are two-stressed lines, and may be an addition (Du.), or corrupt.

16. But even if, being righteous, he were to lift up his head, proud in the sense of innocence (ct. ^{15b}), God would, as fiercely as a lion (cp. Hos. 5^{14} 13^{7}), hunt him down. But neither is the connection with ^{15b}, after the intervening $^{15c.\,d}$, nor the figure of hunting down a man walking proudly erect particularly probable; further, ^{16b} is more closely parallel to ^{17a} than to ^{16a} (note: "again" || "renew"), and if so taken, $^{17b.\,c}$ form a distich instead of the last two lines of a tristich as now. Not improbably ^{16a} is out of place (see phil. n. on ^{15}). Omitting $^{15c.\,d}$ with their rhythmical peculiarities and ^{16a}, the presence of which is the cause of an apparent tristich, and reading יחדש in ^{17a}, the three distichs of which $^{15-17}$ then consist read as follows:

15 If I were wicked (that it would be), woe unto me;
And if I were righteous, that I should not lift up my head;
16b And (that) thou wouldest again show thyself marvellous against me,
17 And renew thy witnesses before me;
(That) thou wouldest increase thy vexation against me,
And bring fresh hosts upon me

The structural redundance of ^{16a} remains, and the other difficulties are at best only alleviated, if we render (reading with 𝔖

17 (That) thou wouldest renew thy witnesses before me,
And increase thy vexation against me,
⌜And bring fresh hosts⌝ upon me.
18 Wherefore, then, hast thou brought me forth out of the womb?
I ought to have given up the ghost, and no eye ought to have seen me.
19 I ought to have been as though I had not been;
I ought to have been borne from the womb to the grave.

ואגאה): "And if I do proudly, like a lion, thou wouldest hunt me"; or (reading ותגאה), "And thou wouldest rise up proudly, like a lion, to hunt me"; or, following 𝔊, "For I am hunted (= יצודני) like a lion for the slaughter" (להרגה for ויגאה).—*Rose up proudly*] See 8^{11} phil. n.

16b. Marvels now, not of creation (cp. נפלאות, 9^{10}) and providence ($^{8-12}$), but of destruction (cp. Is. 29^{14}), torment, and hostility.

17. *Thy witnesses*] Job's "sufferings regarded as so many proofs of his guilt" (Dr.).—*Vexation*] 5^{2} n.—c. 𝔐 is taken to mean "relays and a host are against me," *i.e.* fresh forces—a military (cp. 16^{14} 19^{12}) simile—constantly assail me, my sufferings never cease; this sense is better expressed, with direct reference to God as securing this constant supply of reserves, this perpetuity of suffering, by the emended text (see phil. n.).

18 f. Cp. 3^{11}. For the omission of $^{18f.}$ (Me. Be.) there is no sufficient ground: as Bu. points out, they connect well with what precedes, and the transition from them to $^{20f.}$ is no more abrupt than it would be from ^{17} to $^{20f.}$; still less probable is Sgf.'s omission of $^{18-22}$ as a parallel to v.^{3}: this would make the speech end with v.^{17}—an unlikely conclusion.

19a. Cp. 3^{16a}.—*Borne*] Cp. 21^{32}.

20–22. Turning from the vain reflections of $^{18f.}$ Job, on the ground of the brevity of life and of his rapid (cp. $9^{25f.}$) approach to the dark realm of death, appeals to God to leave him alone that he may cheer up a little. He retains, in spite of his present

20 Are not ⌜the⌝ days ⌜of my life⌝ few?
⌜Look away⌝ from me, that I may brighten up a little,
21 Before I go whence I shall not return,
Unto the land of darkness and dense darkness,
22 A land of gloom, like blackness,
(A land) of dense darkness and disorder,
And where the shining is as blackness.

---

sufferings, which seem to betoken God's hostility, a certain remnant of his former trust in God and reliance on Him as a friend, which allows him to appeal to God for pity: but there is so much sense of the hostility that the relief he craves is that God may cease to take notice of him (ct. 29^{2-5}).

20. 𝔐 literally rendered is: *Are not my days few? Let him cease, let him set* (or, Qrê, *Cease, then, and set*) *from me that I may brighten up a little.* The sense rather questionably imposed upon this by interpreters does not differ substantially from that which is well expressed in the emended text (see phil. n.).—*Brighten up*] 9^{27} n.

21a. Cp. 7^{7-10} 14^{10-12}.

21b, 22. Sheol, the land of darkness, whose very (sun)-shine is black. The text is probably not altogether in order; see phil. n.

XI. Ṣophar's first speech.—By way of apology, yet not politely like Eliphaz (4^{2}), but, like Bildad (8^{2}), bluntly, at once implying his condemnation of Job, Ṣophar begins ($^{2-4}$) with a series of rhetorical questions: Is a man, voluble like Job, and a scoffer too, not to be answered? He then ($^{5-12}$) takes up a point already alluded to by Eliphaz ($5^{9ff.}$), viz. the inscrutability of God's ways; Job had pleaded that God, knowing him to be righteous, treats him as if he were wicked: Ṣophar answers: You have no right to say this, for you cannot read God's mind; you may think yourself righteous, but God may, and indeed, as His treatment of you shows, does, know that you have done wrong; God is beyond question and impossible to oppose. In $^{13-20}$ Ṣophar points the same moral that both Bildad ($8^{5-7.\ 20-22}$) and Eliphaz ($5^{17ff.}$) have previously urged: Let Job turn to God and dispossess iniquity from his life and home: all will then be

XI. [1] Then answered Ṣophar the Naamathite, and said:
[2] Should a multitude of words not be answered?
And should a man full of talk be justified?
[3] Should thy boastings make men hold their peace?
And shouldest thou mock, with none to make thee abashed?

---

well—but dark is the fate of the obstinately wicked ([20]; cp. in Bildad, $8^{11-19.\ 22b}$).

2-4. Referring plainly enough to Job throughout, Ṣophar descends in expression from the general to the particular: in general, should any man be allowed to establish his case merely because he commands an uninterrupted flow of language ([2])? Should Job in particular be allowed to silence every one by his speech, which is at once empty ([3a]) in spite of its amount and irreligious ([3b])? Should he be allowed to give the lie to God by claiming to be righteous ([4]), when He, by His present treatment of Job, is declaring Job to be wicked? For this is tantamount to the blasphemy of charging God with being in the wrong, unrighteous (ct. Ps. $51^{6f.\ (8f.)}$).

2. *A multitude of words*] as Pr. 10^{19}, Qoh. 5^{2}, or, *one* (or, *a man*) *of many words* (cp. [b]).—*A man full of talk*] lit. "a man of lips"—"insinuating (cp. Is. 29^{13}) that Job's words are not really the expression of his heart" (Dr.). Cp. 16^{5} "the solace of my lips," *i.e.* hollow sympathy. Ṣophar is probably thinking less of the length of Job's last speech (Peake), which is scarcely longer than his first, and not greatly longer than that of Eliphaz, than of his apparent irrepressibility: the speeches of Eliphaz and Bildad ought to have silenced him, but they have not.

3, 4. Unlike [2], these vv. are not marked as interrogatives by the use of an interrogative particle; in 𝔐, therefore, they are ambiguous; 𝔐 intends *both* (not only [4], as in EV.) to be taken affirmatively: Thy boastings silence . . . and thou mockest . . . and thou sayest; see phil. n.—*Boastings*] for the word (בדים) see Is. 16^{6} = Jer. 48^{30} (with the same sense as here), and Is. 44^{25}, Jer. 50^{36} † (meaning *boasters, praters*). The punctuation of 𝔐 presupposes the root בדד: even so compare the root ברא

4 ⌈Shouldest⌉ thou say, "My doctrine is pure,
And I was clean in thine eyes"?
5 But oh that God would speak,
And open his lips (in argument) with thee;
6 And that he would declare to thee the secrets of wisdom,
That it is ⌈marvellous⌉ in resourcefulness!
Know, then, that God causeth to be forgotten unto thee somewhat of thine iniquity.

---

of which the vb. occurs in 1 K. 12^{33}, Neh. 6^{8} †, in NH., which also employs the noun בַּדָּאָה, a *liar* (see *NHWB*), and in Syr.—*Mock*] viz. God: cp. the use of the noun (לַעַג) in 34^{7}, and cp. $^{5f.}$ there with ^{4} here. The parallel might suggest that the implicit object is men: so Renan, "Te moqueras-tu des gens"; but this is less probable.

4. Whether taken interrogatively or affirmatively the saying attributed to Job refers not to what he will first say if he is left unanswered (De. Bu.), but is a specimen of the mocking or blasphemy (^{3}) in which he has already indulged: is he to go on saying this kind of thing? The words are not an exact quotation, but summarize Job's assertions of his innocence, which do not appear at all in his first speech (c. 3), and but indirectly in his second ($6^{10c.\ 24.\ 26.\ 29f.}$ $7^{20f.}$), and first become prominent and emphatic ($9^{14-21.\ 30.\ 35}$ $10^{5f.\ 7}$) in the speech to which Ṣophar now replies.—*My doctrine*] for לקח, cp. Dt. 32^{2}, Pr. 4^{2}; but read rather, *My conversation* (i.e. *manner of life*: lit. *my walking*).

5. Job had expressed the wish to speak with God (9^{35}), claiming that given fair conditions he could then establish his innocence: Ṣophar wishes God to speak with Job on a different subject, convinced that God could silence Job—a point which Job would have readily ceded (cp. $9^{15ff.}$)—by making him realize the infinite range of His wisdom ($^{6a.\ b.\ 7-10}$): here, as elsewhere, the friends cannot even perceive Job's point of view.—*With*] 9^{2} n.

6. *Marvellous*] 𝔐 *double*, paraphrased in EV. by "manifold"; see phil. n.—*Resourcefulness*] the word rendered *sound counsel* in 5^{12}: see phil. n. on 5^{12}.

6c. An isolated stichos, exceeding the usual length, and

7 Canst thou find out the immensity of God?
Canst thou attain to the limits of the Almighty?
8 (They are) high⌜er than⌝ heaven; what canst thou do?
Deeper than Sheol; what canst thou know?
9 Longer in measure than the earth,
And broader than the sea.

---

curiously expressed. Its meaning, however, is clear: so far from being pure in God's sight, as you claim (4), and, therefore, unjustly treated by Him in being made to suffer, you are very wicked in His sight, and your sufferings, great as they may be, do not equal the greatness of your wickedness; God forgets (cp. for the same idea expressed by other words, *e.g.* Am. 8^{7}, Is. 43^{25} 64^{8}, Ps. 25^{7}), *i.e.* lets you off the penalty of, part of your wickedness. The direct denial of 4 may be necessary (the view taken by Dr. in the phil. n.), though it is curious in this case that this direct denial is expressed by a single stichos in the middle of the half-dozen distichs devoted to the indirect repudiation of it: how can you claim such knowledge of God, who is infinite in wisdom, and familiar with man's iniquity (11), as to assert that He thinks you just, though He treats you as unjust? Unless Bi. Du. are correct in rejecting 6c as a gloss, the words are probably a mutilated distich which may not have gone beyond contradicting Job's words somewhat as follows: Then thou wouldest know that God doeth rightly, that because of thine iniquity He chastiseth thee.

7. *Immensity*] the word (חקר) "means" properly *something to be searched out* or *explored*: in 38^{16} it is rendered [in EV.] "recesses": and it denotes here the entire range of the divine nature. "The rendering 'by searching' is grammatically impossible" (Dr.), and, moreover, misses the point of the question, which is not whether, by a particular *method*, God's nature can be read by man, but whether its vastness is by any method intelligible to him. The words emphasized by their position in the Hebrew are *immensity* and *limits* (תכלית: cp. 26^{10} 28^{3}).

8, 9. The limits of the Almighty are beyond heaven and Sheol; He knows everything in heaven and earth; man cannot

10 If he pass through, and imprison,
And call an assembly (for judgment), who can turn him back?
11 For *he* knoweth empty men:
He perceiveth naughtiness, also, without considering it.

---

escape his eye (cp. Ps. 139^{1-8}); but what vast tracts of the divine knowledge are withdrawn from Job's ken! Compared with the unknown and unattainable, his knowledge and efforts are nothing: how, then, does he claim (^{4}) that he is righteous in God's judgment? Somewhere in these regions unexplored by Job, the judgment that Job is unrighteous may have been passed. Sgf. omits these vv., as also ^{7}; cp. Du.

10. Du. regards this as a misplaced distich of Job's speech; Be. (see phil. n.) as an interpolation. If the v. is original, Ṣophar takes up Job's words (9^{12}) and turns them back upon him; certainly, as you say, no one can stay God, if He seize or call to judgment, by saying he is not guilty: but this, not because God acts without regard to whether men are right or wrong, but because (^{11}) He knows the sins of men, however blind men like yourself may be to them. In this case we should perhaps read *seize* for *pass through* (see phil. n.), and possibly *kill* (יקטיל) for *call an assembly* (Richter); otherwise, for the judicial assembly, cp. Ezk. 16^{40} $23^{46f.}$, Pr. 5^{14}.

11. God acts, unhindered (^{10}) and unerringly, because, unlike men who, even if they give the closest attention to the matter, are often deceived about both others and themselves, He knows all about men and their sins, instantaneously and without effort. The thought would be similar in 34^{23}, if the text there were correct.—*Empty men*] so Ps. 26^{4} (‖ "dissemblers").—*Without considering it*] Du. *and it he considers*, *i.e.* God gives heed to it; al. *which they consider*, or *one considers, not*, *i.e.* God perceives what man does not—a thought actually present in the passage, but not naturally expressed by 𝔐, nor quite satisfactorily by the emendation proposed (see phil. n.). Jacob (*ZATW*, 1912, 283): *being himself unperceived* (יִתְבּוֹנָן, Hithpolal for Hithpolel of 𝔐); but this thought also is not required here.

12 And so a hollow man getteth understanding,
And a wild ass's colt is born (again) a man.
13 If *thou* direct thine heart aright,
And stretch out thine hands towards him—
14 If naughtiness be in thine hand, put it far away,
And let not unrighteousness dwell in thy tent—
15 Surely then thou wilt lift up thy face without spot;
And thou wilt be established and wilt not fear:
16 For thou wilt forget (thy) misery;
Thou wilt remember it as waters that are passed away;

---

12. "As a result of the judgments of the Almighty ($^{10f.}$), conceit and ignorance are removed, and a wilful, defiant nature (like Job's) is softened" (Dr.). This view of the v. makes it a transition to the thought of $^{13-20}$; but no such transition is obtained, if the v. is taken, as in itself it quite well might be, to mean: it is as impossible to get sense into an empty-headed man as to tame the untameable (39^5) wild ass. See for this, phil. n.; and for a collection and criticism of many other interpretations of the v., see Di.

13–20. By submitting to God's judgments ($^{10-12}$) and turning to Him, Job may yet return to prosperity and honour.

13. *Thou*] the pron. is emphatic: even thou, with all thy wickedness, if thou wilt abandon it (^{14}), mayest be restored.—*Hands*] the hands opened (כפים: cp. Ex. $9^{29.33}$, Ezr. 9^5, Ps. 44^{21} $88^{10(9)}$ 63^5 141^2), and stretched out (פרש: as 1 K. $8^{22.54}$ al.: cp. שטח, Ps. 88^{10}) in prayer: see 31^{27} n., Is. 1^{15} n. Both here (see ^{14a}) and in Isaiah the context suggests that the idea of innocency may have been associated with the custom of stretching out the *opened* hand in prayer. But such association was scarcely constant, for with כף the term יד interchanges: cp. *e.g.* Ps. 143^6 28^2.

14. *Hand*] יד: ct. כפים in ^{13}.—b. Cp. 22^{23} (Eliphaz).

15a. Cp. 10^{15b}.—*Without spot*] commonly and, if original, perhaps correctly taken as antithetical to $10^{15b.c}$: Job's face will no longer bear the marks of a guilty conscience.

16. *Waters that are passed away*] the whole line as a parallel to ^{a} can only mean: or if you remember your misery

17 And ⌈thy⌉ life will rise up more (brightly) than the noonday;
Though it be dark, it will become as the morning.
18 And thou wilt be secure, because there is hope;
And thou wilt search (around), and wilt take thy rest in safety;
19 And thou wilt lie down, with none to make thee afraid.
And many will make suit unto thee;
20 But the eyes of the wicked will fail;

---

at all, it will only be a memory of something that is past or has vanished; for waters as perilous and dangerous, cp. 12[15] 22[11] 27[20], Is. 43[2]; for the vb. (עבר) in the sense required, cp. 6[15] (of water as here, but more commonly of time, *e.g.* Ps. 90[4]). The vb. used of waters also means *to overflow, to flood* (Is. 8[8], Nah. 1[8]); but it is scarcely necessary to assume a play on the two meanings—waters once in perilous flood, but now vanished, and ill-advised to rob the line of its colour by reading (ימים), *as days that are passed away* (Ehrlich).

17. Another striking antithesis to what Job had said (10[21f.]): Job's future need not be a day of darkness whose very noon is night, it may, if he wills, be a day brighter than any ordinary day at noon, whose very night is bright as morning (cp. Is. 58[10]).

18. Searching round, before going to rest for the night, finding nothing amiss, Job will lie down with a sense of security.—*Search* (*around*)] the vb. (חפר = حفر) used in 3[21]. Ehrlich suggests *thou shalt be protected* (וְחֻפַּרְתָּ, from חפר = خفر, the sense *protect* being that of the Arabic, but not elsewhere in the OT. of the Hebrew vb.). On the not altogether certain text, see phil. n.

19a. Recurs in Is. 17[2], Zeph. 3[13]; cp. also Is. 14[30].—*Lie down*] the vb. (רבץ) involves, as in the references just given, an implicit comparison with animals (cp. Gn. 49[9]).

19b. Lit. "And many will make sweet thy face." For *make sweet the face*, cp. Pr. 19[6], Ps. 45[13] (as here of men), and, *e.g.*, Ex. 32[11], Mal. 1[9], Jer. 26[19]. Note the parallelism of "thy face" with "the eyes of the wicked" in [20a]. If Job turns to God, instead of being given the cold shoulder, as poor men

And their refuge is perished from them,
And their hope is the breathing out of the soul

---

regularly are (cp. Pr. 19^7), and avoided as he is now (cp. 19^{13-19}), he will become again a great and wealthy personage whose favour it is worth while to seek (cp. Pr. 19^6).

20a. But if Job remains wicked, he will look in vain for any deliverance from his present miserable position. In contrast with the directness of the first line of the distich, the alternative fate that awaits Job is stated indirectly: cp. 8^{22b} after $8^{21.\,22a}$. —*Eyes . . . will fail*] 17^5, Dt. 28^{32}, La. 4^{17}, Ps. $69^{4\,(3)}$.

20b, c. As there is no hope of deliverance for the wicked (^{20a}), so there is no way of escape; consequently their only hope is death, or, perhaps (see phil. n. on 31^{39}), despair.

XII.–XIV. Job's reply to Ṣophar's first speech.—This, like his previous speeches (see on cc. 6 f. and 9 f.), is only in part (12^2–13^{19}) addressed to the friends: the rest (13^{20}–14^{22}) is addressed to God. The connection in several places is difficult to detect, and some verses at least ($12^{4-6.\,9}$ if not also $^{7f.\,10.\,11f.}$) seem out of place and no part of the speech. Grill (*Zur Kritik der Komposition des Buchs Hiobs*, p. 13 ff.) goes so far as to omit 12^4–13^2, Sgf. 12^4–13^1, but that $12^{13ff.}$ with its description of the activity of God as *might not guided by moral considerations* was interpolated as proof that Job could speak of God's *wisdom* even better than Ṣophar, is improbable. Job begins by sarcastically allowing that the friends are exceptionally wise (12^2)—and yet their speeches have contained nothing but what was familiar to himself (^{3}), and even to beasts ($^{7-10}$). What is said even on the authority of the aged must be received with discrimination ($^{11f.}$). Job now himself descants on the mighty (though also, he suggests, capricious) activity of God ($^{13-25}$), for he knows quite as much about this as do his wise friends ($13^{1f.}$); but all this is irrelevant to the case he has to argue out with God (^{3}): let the friends, then, keep silence, and not continue to show by their interpretation of God's activities partiality on God's behalf: let them beware lest He punish them for such conduct ($^{4-12}$). Let them keep silence while Job states his case against God: for stating it God may slay him: but he will take the risk: for he

XII. 1 Then Job answered and said,
2 No doubt but ye are ⌜they that know⌝,
And with you wisdom will die.
3 But I have understanding as well as you;
I am not inferior to you:
Yea, who knoweth not such things as these?

---

is certain of his innocence, and his readiness to face God should be a pledge of victory ($^{13-19}$). And now Job turns to address God directly: Let Him not overwhelm Job with terror ($^{20-22}$); but let Him state the iniquities (^{23}), if there are such, which would justify His present use of His might in pursuing so helpless a creature as Job ($^{24-28}$). From his own case Job passes to that of mankind in general: Is any man—frail, shortlived and, unlike trees, without hope of reviving when once cut down in death—worth all the hostility shown by God (14^{1-12})? If only God's anger might pass and give way even after death to friendly intercourse with Job, how willingly would Job await this change! ($^{13-15}$). But there is no hope for either Job or man: God persists in being hostile and dwelling on Job's sins ($^{16f.}$); and He brings men one and all to death in which knowledge vanishes, and only pain remains ($^{17-22}$).

2 f. In ^{2} Job ironically concedes that the three friends are the only living, and will prove to have been the last surviving, embodiment of wisdom; in ^{3}, dropping the irony, he claims that all the wisdom uttered was previously and independently in his possession, and indeed in that of every man; their would-be wise speeches have consisted of well-worn commonplaces.

2. *They that know*] cp. 34^{2}: 𝔐 *people*; see phil. n.

3. *Understanding*] cp. 11^{12}: you were so good as to suggest that even I might *get* understanding; judged by the standard of your "wise" speeches, I *have* it already.—b = 13^{2b}.—*Who knoweth not*] lit. *with whom* (*are*) *not; with* (את) like 10^{13} (עם): see n. there and *Lex.* 86*a*, top.

4–6. The interpretation of these vv. is difficult, partly, it is probable, on account of textual corruption, partly because they are misplaced. Di. makes as good an effort as any one to establish a connection: Job "complains of the manner in

4 I am to be (as one that is) a laughing-stock to his neighbour,
(A man) that called upon God, and he answered him!
The just, the perfect man, is a laughing-stock!
5 In the thought of him that is at ease there is contempt for misfortune;
(It is) ready for them whose foot slippeth.

---

which, on the ground of such wisdom, they treat him, a pious man, who can boast of his inward relation to God—though to be sure it is like the world, which has only contempt for the unfortunate, while the prosperous godless remain untouched." "His neighbour" (^{4a}) is on this view an oblique reference to Ṣophar or the three friends; but Ṣophar and the other friends, though they have expressed their concern at what appears to them the impiety of Job's present manner of speech, and though they have suggested that his sufferings are due to his sins, have not *laughed* (even in 11^{12}, as Ley suggests) at him or his calamities, nor is it altogether satisfactory to say that though they have not actually done so, Job may feel that they have.

4. *A laughing-stock*] one at whose helplessness or misfortunes men laugh as an expression of their (malignant) delight: cp. the use of the nouns in Jer. 20^7, La. 3^{14} (שחק), Hab. 1^{10} (משחק), and the vb. in 30^1, Ps. 52^8, La. 1^7.—b. The line is commonly taken as descriptive of the speaker (Job) whom God answered *in the past* (cp. 29^{2-5}); the part. (קרא) could of course refer to the past, but it is very questionable whether the line is a natural description of himself by Job at a time when, though he still calls, he appears to receive no answer. Ley treats the line as ironically descriptive of the neighbour (*i.e.* Ṣophar); in which case we should render $^{b.\,c}$ in English: To one that calls upon God and He answers him, A laughing-stock to the just, the perfect man.

5. The v. is curiously phrased, of unusual rhythmical form, and the text cannot be implicitly trusted: see phil. n.—*Contempt for misfortune*] 𝔐 may also be translated *a contemptible torch*; but this yields nothing satisfactory, whether taken as continuing (^{4}) "a laughing-stock, a contemptible torch," or as subj. of ^{b} (King).

6 The tents of robbers prosper,
And they that provoke God are secure;
(Even) he that bringeth (his) God in his hand!
7 But ask now the beasts, and they will teach thee;
And the fowls of the heaven, and they will tell thee:
8 Or ⌈the crawling things of⌉ the earth, and they will teach thee:
And the fishes of the sea will declare unto thee.

---

6. *Robbers*] lit. *wasters, devastators*.—b, c. The existing text is commonly taken to mean: those are secure who provoke God by their wicked conduct ^{b}, and ^{c} who so entirely disregard God as to recognize only their own might as their god: cp. Hab. 1^{11} "this his might becometh his god." Still the form of the v. (a tristich), the change from the pl. in ^{b} to the sing. in ^{c} and the curious phrasing of ^{c} together throw doubt on the correctness of the text.

7–10. So far from the wisdom on which the friends pride themselves being their exclusive possession (^{2}), not only Job (^{3}), but the very beasts share it, $^{7-10}$. This, if the passage is in its right place, must be the connection of thought; but it is strangely stated; for Job's charge is not that the friends lack the particular knowledge in question, and *need to be taught*, which is the point emphasized in $^{7f.}$, but that they have *no need to teach* things so universally known, ^{3c}. Inasmuch as there are other suspicious features in the passage it may be misplaced; the address to a single person is very unusual in Job's speeches (26^{2} n.), but would be at once explained if the passage originally stood in a speech of one of the friends (cp. ^{7a} with 8^{8a}); yet ^{9}, at least, with its use of the name Yahweh (see Introd.), is more probably altogether foreign to the book.—*Ask*] the vb., contrary to the prevailing use in Job's speeches, is sing., and, if the text and connection are original (but see above), addressed accordingly to Ṣophar exclusively; Di. endeavours to account for this by suggesting that Ṣophar has deserved this special attention by his words "hollow man" in 11^{12}.

8. *The crawling things of the earth*] 𝔐 might be rendered either *talk thou to the earth*, or *the plants* (שיח, as in 30^{4}) *of* (ל as in ^{6a}: see phil. n.) *the earth*; but the text needs emending as, or substantially as, above; see phil. n.

9 Who knoweth not by all these,
That the hand of Yahweh hath wrought this?
10 In whose hand is the soul of every living thing,
And the breath of all flesh of man.

9a. *By all these*] *i.e.* by means of (בְּ, as Gn. 42[33], Ex. 7[17], Nu. 16[28]—all with ידע, as here), by observing, all these creatures. Or the line may be translated, *who among* (בְּ, as, *e.g.*, Is. 50[10]; *Lex.* 88*a* bot.), *i.e.* which of, *all these* (creatures) *does not know*. But the line may be merely a misplaced interpretation of [3c], and have meant: Who doth not know the like (כ for ב) of all these things? In that case [b] (= Is. 41[20c]) would be an isolated stichos cited (originally on the margin) from Isaiah. In the present context it is not clear to what *this* refers. Some understand it to refer to the universe; and appeal to the similar meaning of "all these" in Is. 66[2], Jer. 14[22]; but in these passages the heavens, etc., are mentioned in the immediate context. Others have explained *this* as (Hi.) pointing backward and referring to the security of the wicked ([6])—not a likely theme for the beasts to discourse on; or to the irresistible activity of God described by Ṣophar (11[10f.]), or as pointing forward to the activities of God described in [13ff.]; but, as Di. observes, 11[10f.] lies too far behind to be naturally referred to thus, and the pf. tense and the intervening vv. ([11f.]) render the reference forward to [13ff.] improbable.

10. If [9] be an interpolation (see last n.), this v. contains the instruction given by the beasts, [7f.]; in this case render: that (אשר as Ex. 11[7], Lv. 5[5], Dt. 1[31], Eccles. 8[12]: cp. 9[5] phil. n.; *Lex.* 83*a* bot.) in His (God unnamed, as in v.[13]) hand is the soul of every living thing, etc.—*All flesh of man*] a very strange expression; *of man*, it is true (Bu.), limits the expression *all flesh*, which without it might, but does not always (34[15], Nu. 16[22] n.), include living beings not human; but this fact does not make the expression natural or, least of all in poetry, likely. Equally insufficient is Del.'s suggestion that the addition of איש individualizes the expression, as though the meaning were: the breath of each individual human being. 𝔊 omits *all flesh*; but rhythm scarcely permits a shortening of the line. Possibly *of man* is a corruption of some term parallel to "in his hand"

11 Doth not the ear test words,
Even as the palate tasteth its food?
12 With aged men is wisdom,
And length of days is understanding.
13 With him is wisdom and might;
He hath counsel and understanding.

---

in [a], such as *with him*, or *he can withdraw* (cp. 34[14], Ps. 104[29]).

11 (= 34[3]), **12.** The connection is still rather elusive: it has been claimed that [7–10] refer to what one could *see* of God's power, [11f.] to what one might learn by *hearing* what the aged had to say; cp. 13[1] (so Dav. Dr.): on this view [11] means: "does not the ear *test* the words which it hears, and accept those which, like the wisdom of the aged (v.[12]), embody sound knowledge?" (Dr.). But does this allow for the unlimited range which [11] claims for the discriminative faculty, or for the fact that the appeal to the wisdom of the ancients is elsewhere made by the friends, 8[8ff.] 15[10], and criticized by Job, so that the use made of it, on this interpretation, by Job in [12], though not exactly inconsistent with what he has said before, is yet rather improbable? The point of the v. may then be rather this: as the palate discriminates between good and bad food, and accepts the one and rejects the other (cp. 2 S. 19[36 (35)]), so the ear discriminates between the true and false in whatever it is told; you have poured your "wisdom" into my ears (12[2]), you refer me to what the ancients tell me; but I will accept none of this unexamined: I will exercise my own judgment on it. On this view we must understand "you say" before [12]: cp., on certain theories of those passages, 21[16. 19]. Sgf. rejects the vv.; Di. suggests that if retained they might better stand between [8] and [9]; alternatively the difficulty of the connection may be due to the vv. being the fragmentary survival of a once longer passage.

13. You say: [12] wisdom resides in old men, [13] I say it is to be found with God: so if both [12] and [13] originally belonged here we may least awkwardly connect them in thought; but the antithesis is formally unexpressed and is very artificial, for the friends have never asserted that wisdom resides only in old men

and *not* in God, and Job in [13] does not assert that wisdom resides *only* (cp. c. 28) with God, and is not imparted by Him to men. Further, while [12] speaks of wisdom, [13] speaks of wisdom *and might*, so that in this respect, too, the sharpness and clearness of an antithesis are sacrificed. But while [13] connects at best rather awkwardly with [12], it might form a starting-point for the illustrations which follow ([14–25]) of God's power, and, though this is much less prominent, of His wisdom. If the reference to God unnamed (which must be assumed even if [13] originally followed [12]) can be tolerated, [13] might follow [3] as Job's proof that his knowledge is not inferior to that of the friends. Du., retaining [11f.], rejects [13] as a variant of [16].—*Counsel*] read, perhaps, *power*: see phil. n.

14–25. Illustrations, derived from Job's own observation, of the way in which God's might ([13]) "frustrates all human endeavour, and overthrows all human institutions" (Dr.). In all this Job traces no moral purpose; cp. especially [14b], so similar to 11[10] (Ṣophar), but not followed as in 11[11] by any suggestion that the men imprisoned by God are doers of iniquity. The writer (if [21. 24f.] are integral to his poem) seems to have in mind not only Ṣophar's speech, but also Ps. 107, and perhaps Is. 44[24–28]; in any case [21a. 24b] verbally reproduce Ps. 107[40] and, by reason of vocabulary or figure, [14b] recalls Ps. 107[16], [15] Ps. 107[33–36], [22b. 18] Ps. 107[14], [23. 24b. 25b] Ps. 107[4. 7. 27a], [25a] Ps. 107[10]; with [17], cp. Is. 44[25], with [15a] Is. 44[27]. But, whereas alike in the Ps. and Is. both the constructive and the destructive activities of God are presented, and these as determined by the different moral characters of men, here only the destructive activity is presented: so, *e.g.*, here ([15]) waters are withheld or destructively employed, but in Is. 44[27] beneficently employed, in the Ps. given or withheld according to the character of the men concerned. So the Psalmist's survey reveals to the "upright" the loving-kindness, where the "upright" (1[1]) Job sees only the might, of God. As in 7[17f.] Job parodies Ps. 8[4], so here he sees facts noted by another Psalmist under a very different aspect.

14. Whether [a] refers to the destruction of cities (Peake) is not quite clear; the line may refer figuratively to persons (cp.

14 Behold, he pulleth down, and it cannot be built again;
He shutteth up a man, and there can be no opening.
15 Behold, he withholdeth the waters, and they dry up;
Again he sendeth them out, and they overturn the earth.
16 With him is strength and sound counsel;
He that erreth and he that leadeth into error, are his;
17 Who leadeth counsellors away stripped,
And who maketh judges fools.
18 He looseth the ⌜bonds⌝ imposed by kings,
And bindeth a waistcloth on their loins;

Jer. 1^{10}), both lines meaning: God ruins men's lives irretrievably.—*Shutteth up*] סגר על; but this does not necessarily refer to subterranean dungeons (cp. Jer. 38^{6}, La. 3^{53}): for the same idiom is used in Ex. 14^{3}.

15a. Drought; **b**, destructive floods. Ct. Eliphaz's reference to rain.

16. *Sound counsel*] 5^{12} n.—**b.** All men belong to God, and are within the range and subject to the working of *His* might.—*He that erreth*, etc.] all men (see phil. n.), viewed particularly, perhaps, under the aspect of "nations misled by their statesmen into a disastrous policy" (Dr.). In any case moral error is not primarily intended.

17. Doing with them as He wills, God makes even the wise ones of the earth look foolish. There is as little reason to limit the historical allusions to the fortunes of Israel as the illustrations from nature in ^{15} to Palestine: indeed the plural "kings" in ^{18b} and the unmistakable reference to nations in $^{23f.}$ make it as plain as may be that the author is reflecting on the rise and fall of nations, and of the ruin in which the most exalted and firmly established individuals in these nations are involved when their land and people are overthrown: there is no reason, therefore, to think with Du. specially of *Jewish* priests in ^{19a} and of the descendants of David in ^{19b}.—*Who leadeth . . . away stripped*] probably due here to assimilation to ^{19a}: the vb. in ^{a} originally was more closely parallel to that in ^{b}: see phil. n.

18. He sets at naught the power of kings, undoing the

19 Who leadeth priests away stripped,
And overthroweth them that are firmly established;
20 Who depriveth the trusty of speech,
And taketh away the discretion of the elders;
21 Who poureth contempt upon princes,
And looseneth the belt of the ⌜strong⌝;
22 Who discovereth deep things out of darkness,
And bringeth out to light black gloom;
23 Who increaseth nations and destroyeth them;
Who spreadeth ⌜peoples⌝ abroad, and leaveth them.

---

fetters they have placed on others [a], and reducing kings themselves to the position of captives [b] (cp. Is. 47); see phil. n.

19. Similar treatment of other classes of ancient lineage and secure position.—*Firmly established*] men whose family have long held, and appeared likely long to hold (see phil. n.), their position: the *priests* in [a] are a particular illustration of such classes: in Israel, especially in later times, as among other peoples, the priesthood was hereditary.

20. *Speech*] Heb. *lip*, as, *e.g.*, Gn. 11^{1}, Is. 19^{18}.—*The trusty*] especially perhaps "trusted ministers" (Dr.) of state: cp. Is. $19^{11f.}$.

21a. = Ps. 107^{40a}.—*Princes*] or *nobles* (נדיבים); cp. 22^{8} 34^{18} (‖ "king"), 1 S. 2^{8} = Ps. 113^{8} (antithetical to "poor" and "needy"; cp. 𝔊 here), Nu. 21^{18} and Pr. 8^{16} (‖ שׂרים).—*Looseneth the belt of*] "Fig. for incapacitates; the flowing garments of the Oriental being girt up for active service (1 K. 18^{46}, Is. 5^{27}, cp. Is. 45^{1})" (Dr.). *Looseneth* is lit. *causeth to hang down.*—*Strong*] this word at least (see phil. n.), if not the whole line, requires emendation. Possibly [b] is a corrupt variant of (cp. Du.) [20b], and the whole v. secondary: cp. vv. [24. 25].

22. Bu. omits the v. as in its complete abstractness alien to the context: if in its right place, it must be figurative; the deep, dark things have been explained as hidden plans and conspiracies of men (cp. Is. 29^{15}; so Di. Dr.), the depths of the divine nature (Schl.), the treasures of conquered cities (Hi.), the poor (Hgst. Du.).

23. The rise and fall of nations illustrate God's caprice: He

24 Who taketh away the understanding of the chiefs of the earth,
And causeth them to wander in a pathless waste.
25 They grope in the dark without light,
And ⌜they⌝ wander about (helplessly) like a drunken man.

XIII. 1 Lo, mine eye hath seen all,
Mine ear hath heard and understood it.

---

makes them increase in numbers and extend their borders only thereafter to destroy and abandon them. This would form an effective climax and conclusion, and perhaps originally did so; see on [24f.].—*Peoples*] 𝕳 *nations*, as in [a].—*Leaveth*] 𝕸 *leadeth them* (*away*): see phil. n. *Leaveth* is rather anti-climactic after *destroyeth* in [a]: Ehrlich makes the v. refer exclusively to the destruction of nations, rendering, Who misleadeth peoples and destroyeth them, layeth peoples low and (so) leaveth them, giving to שטח a meaning of the Ar. *saṭaḥa*, *to prostrate*.

24 f. From the "nations" in [23], [24a] returns to leading individuals of the nations (as [17–21]). Since the opening words are identical, [24a] may be a variant of [20a], and similarly [25b] of [24b], and a single distich ([24b–25a]) may have completed the description of the nations in [23]. Alternatively [24f.] may have originally stood after [21], completing the allusions to prominent individuals.

24. *Of the earth*] 𝕳 (not 𝕲) *of the people of the earth.*—*Waste*] *Tôhu*: cp. 6^{18} n.

25. *They grope*] 5^{14}.—*They wander about*] 𝕳 *he causeth them to wander*, exactly as [24b] (cp. Is. 19^{14}).

XIII. 1–5. Resumes 12^{3}: Job has himself observed everything relating to God's rule of the world, and is in such knowledge not a whit inferior to the friends, [1f.]: he, indeed, interprets differently, and does not, as they have done, draw the conclusion that he is guilty. Of their false and worthless interpretation, he has had enough, and can only wish that they would keep silence, [4f.]; with God, not with them, he now wishes to speak and argue out the question of his guilt ([3]), and this is what from [20] onwards he actually does.

1. *All*] not *this* (𝕲), or *all* (*this*)—EV.: see phil. n.

[2] What ye know, *I* know also:
I am not inferior unto you,
[3] But *I* would speak unto the Almighty,
And to argue with God do I desire.
[4] But ye are plasterers of falsehood,
Physicians of no value are ye all.
[5] Oh that ye would but hold your peace,
And it should be your wisdom.

2b. = 12^{3b}.

3. *Argue*] v.[15b].

4. *Plasterers of falsehood*] cp. Ps. 119^{69}; here, persons who use falsehoods as a whitewash or plaister (cp. [b]) to hide defects: the defects which appear to Job so glaring in God's use of His might (12^{13-25}), the friends whitewash over with the assertion, known to Job to be false, that all who suffer from that might are wicked.—*Physicians of no value*] the word *rophe* is used widely enough (cp. Gn. 50^2, 2 Ch. 16^{12}) to justify such a translation in a suitable context. But *worthless healers*, or *menders*, would perhaps be better here. The friends are men who try lightly but fruitlessly to mend the broken scheme of things; Du. pertinently compares for the use of the vb. and the here implicit figure, Jer. 6^{14} "And they lightly heal what is broken (in the body) of my people, saying, It is whole, it is whole, when it is not whole" (cp. *Exp. Times*, xxvi. 347 ff.). Others, falling back on a meaning of the root unknown in Hebrew, but paralleled in Arabic and Ethiopic (*to mend, stitch together*), render *stitchers together of worthless* (*assertions*) (so Di.), then cp. [12].

5b. Cp. Pr. 17^{28}: even fools, if they have but the wit to keep silence, may pass for wise.

6-19. Before, in [20ff.], addressing God, as he has in [3] expressed his intention of doing, Job, developing his accusation in [4], warns the friends of the risks they are, as it would seem unwittingly, running in using falsehoods in defence of God, [7-12]; on the other hand, he himself will deliberately accept every hazard to which he may expose himself by asserting the truth, viz. that he is guiltless, [13-16]: yet, for the moment at least, he is sure that as God will resent the falsehood uttered

6 Hear now the argument ⌜of⌝ my ⌜mouth⌝,
And attend to the pleadings of my lips.
7 Will ye for *God* speak unrighteously,
And for *him* talk deceitfully?
8 Will ye show partiality for *him*?
Will ye contend for *God*?
9 Is it good that he should search you out?
Or as one deludeth a man, will ye delude him?
10 He will surely correct you,
If in secret ye show partiality.
11 Will not his loftiness affright you?
And his dread fall upon you?
12 Your maxims are proverbs of ashes,
Your defences are defences of clay.

---

by the friends in His defence (10), so He will admit the truth maintained by Job against Him (18).

6. *Argument*] or, *impeachment*, *reproof*: cp. Pr. $1^{23. 25}$.—*Pleadings*] or, *accusations*.

7. Cp. 27^{4}.

8–10. Will you, as judges between me and God, show unfair favour to the stronger, pronouncing me guilty, though all the time I am innocent, in order that He may win His case? But God sees through this kind of thing (9), and so far from rewarding it punishes it (10).—*Show partiality*] lit. *lift up the face*, here with the sinister implication that this is done from corrupt motives: cp. Dt. 10^{17} "Who doth not lift up the face, nor take a bribe"; Pr. 18^{5} "It is not good to lift up the face of the guilty, (thereby) turning aside the innocent (from his right) in judgment"; c. 32^{21} 34^{19}, Ps. 82^{2}. The phrase may also be used without this sinister implication: see $42^{8f.}$.

10a. Anticipating $42^{7f.}$.

11. *Loftiness*] 31^{23}, there also ‖ to *dread*, for which cp. Is. $2^{10. 19}$ (‖ "glorious majesty"), where it is explicitly used of the dread inspired by Yahweh when He rises up to judgment. In view of $41^{17\,(25)}$ we might also render *uprising*: so Du.

12. The sayings, which to the friends themselves seem so wise, will prove worthless defences against God (11).—*Maxims*]

[13] Hold your peace, let me alone, that *I* may speak,
And let come on me what will.
[14] ^I will take my flesh in my teeth,
And put my life in my hand!
[15] Behold, he will slay me; I have no hope;
Nevertheless I will maintain my ways before him.
[16] Even that is to me (an omen of) salvation;
For not before him doth a godless man come.

---

see phil. n.—*Defences*] scarcely *ramparts* (see phil. n.), but rather *bosses* (cp. 15^{26}) of shields; being of clay instead of iron, their bosses are useless.

13–15. Job intends at all hazards (cp. $9^{21f.}$) to speak freely in maintaining his integrity.

14. *I take*] 𝔐 *wherefore do I take*, which is incompatible with the context: RVm. "At all adventures I will take," is not a justifiable translation of 𝔐: see phil. n. The idiom in [a] does not occur again, but must be synonymous with *put my life in my hand* in [b], which means to imperil one's life (see phil. n.). Herz (*Orient. Literaturz.*, Aug. 1913, p. 343, and *JThS* xv. 263), arguing, on the ground of Egyptian parallels, that the idioms mean to take extra care of one's life, defends 𝔐.

15. As in $7^{6f.}$ 9^{25} 10^{20}, Job expresses his sense of the near approach of death.—*I have no hope*] lit. *I wait not*, *sc.* for anything better (cp. 14^{14}); Qrê (cp. *'A* 𝔖𝔗𝔙 EV.) *for him* (emphatic) *I wait*; see phil. n.—*Maintain*] lit. *argue*, *prove right*, as v.[8].

16. *That*] the fact that Job can and does maintain his integrity before God ([15b]): this is his ground of hope that he will ultimately have salvation, *i.e.* success or victory (so, *e.g.*, Ps. 18^{51}, 2 S. 23^{10}), in his argument with God, and that God will admit and publish his innocence; the reason for this hope lies in the fact ([16b]) that a godless man does not thus of his own accord approach God to argue his integrity. The sense is substantially the same if the v. be rendered, Even that is . . . *that* a godless man doth not come before him; in this case [16b] contains not the ground for the assertion in [a], but the explication of the pronoun *that*: for the pronoun thus neutrally used,

17 Hear diligently my speech,
And let my declaration be in your ears.
18 Behold, now, I have set out ⌜my⌝ case;
I know that I shall be justified.
19 Who is he that will contend with me?
For then would I hold my peace and give up the ghost.

20 Only two things do not unto me,
Then will I not hide myself from thy face:
21 Thine hand withdraw far from me;
And let not thy terror affright me.
22 Then call thou, and *I* will respond;
Or I will speak, and answer thou me.

---

see 15^{9} 31^{28}. The rendering, Even He, viz. God, is my salvation (RVm.), is unsatisfactory; since ^{b}, which must be then rendered *for*, etc., does not go well with it.—*Godless*] 8^{13} n.

18 f. After an appeal (^{17}, regarded by Bi. Di. Du. as interpolated) to the friends not merely to give him the opportunity to speak (^{13}), but also to listen carefully to his statement of his case, Job repeats in different ways his conviction of his innocence already expressed in $^{15f.}$: the clear statement of his case (^{18a}) must carry conviction; he will obtain a verdict of innocent (^{18b}); so clear a case as his no one would care to challenge (^{19a}); were it otherwise, Job would rather die than live (^{19b}).

18. *I have set out my case*] in $^{23ff.}$: see phil. n.—*I shall be justified*] the justice of my plea will be admitted, and I shall be pronounced to be in the right in the case at issue: cp. 11^{2}, Is. $43^{9.\,26}$.

19a. Is. 50^{8}.

20. From here on Job addresses God; and first he begs, as he has done previously (9^{34}), that God will allow the case to be decided fairly and in a legal way, and not by the exercise of God's irresistible might; this only granted, Job is certain of establishing his case whether—he gives God the choice—he prefers a charge against God, or God prefers one against him.

21. Cp. 9^{34} 33^{7}.

22. Let God be plaintiff (^{a}) or defendant (^{b}), as He will; cp. $9^{14ff.}$.—*Call*] or *cite*: 9^{16} n.—*Answer*] 9^{16} n.

23 How many are mine iniquities and sins?
Make me to know my transgression and my sin.
24 Wherefore hidest thou thy face,
And holdest me for thine enemy?
25 Wilt thou scare a driven leaf?
And wilt thou pursue the dry stubble?
26 That thou writest bitter things against me,
And makest me to inherit the iniquities of my youth:

---

23 ff. God failing to respond to Job's invitation in ^{22a} to formulate His charges, Job speaks on; not, however, strictly according to the figure of ^{22b}, in the form of a legal indictment, but at first suggesting by a series of questions that he is suffering far beyond the deserts of any failings of his ($^{23-28}$); then passing on to reflections on God's pitiless treatment of mankind in general (14^{1-12}), returning in $^{13-17}$ to his own case, and appealing in $^{13-15}$ to God's pity, only in $^{16f.}$ to record again the actual ruthlessness of His treatment of him, and ($^{18-22}$) of men in general.

23. Job, though "perfect" (1^{1} n.), does not deny that he has sinned (cp. ^{26b}); but how often? how greatly? not enough to deserve all the suffering that he endures; hence his implicit charge against God that He is punishing undeservedly and unjustly.

24. *Hidest thou thy face*] refusest to be friendly; for the idiom, cp. Ps. $30^{8(7)}$ ("in thy favour," and "thou hidest thy face"—antithetical parallels), 104^{29}, 27^{9} ("hide the face" ‖ "cast off in anger"), Is. 54^{8}; for "the hiding of the face" in resentment for sin committed and wrong done against God (cp. v.^{23} here), see Is. 57^{17}, Dt. 31^{17}.—**b.** Cited by Elihu, 33^{10}.

25 ff. Is it worthy of one mighty as God with such persistent severity to treat one so helpless and incapable of resistance as Job? cp. 7^{20} 10^{16}.—*Scare a driven leaf*] make to tremble with fright (cp. ערץ in Is. $2^{19.21}$) a dry leaf already driven (Lv. 26^{36}) hither and thither by the wind.—*Pursue dry stubble*] put to flight (רדף in Dt. 32^{30}, Am. 1^{11}) what scurries away of itself.

26. *Writest bitter things*] passest on me sentence to painful

27 And that thou puttest my feet in the stocks,
And markest all my paths:
About the soles of my feet thou drawest thee a line;
28 Though (one such as) he falleth away like a rotten thing,
Like a garment that is moth-eaten.

---

punishment: on the custom of recording in writing judicial sentences, see n. on Is. 10[1]. In view of [b] a judicial is more probable than a medical figure here: the meaning of [a] is not, therefore, that Thou prescribest for me bitter medicines (Hi.); of written medical prescriptions among the Hebrews there is no evidence.—**b.** Job had sinned in the carelessness of youth like others (cp. 1[5], Ps. 25[7]); but is it worthy of God to drag up these old offences, and make Job suffer for them now? Even in youth he had not sinned more than others: why does he suffer more?

27. Job's condition figured as that of a prisoner whose movements are impeded, and who is kept under close watch.—*Stocks*] a different word from that so rendered in EV. of Jer. 20[2f.] 29[26] and RVm. of 2 Ch. 16[10]; on the ground that some movement along paths ([b]) is possible, some (Du. Peake) suppose that the Hebrew term used here (*sad*) denotes not fixed stocks, but a block of wood fastened to the legs of captives to impede, though not altogether prevent, movement from place to place. Yet it is doubtful whether the idiom favours this interpretation; and in the Talmud *sadda* is certainly something that, like *stocks*, confines the person to a single spot: Levy (*NHWB*, *s.v.*) cites from *Pes.* 28[a] "The *sad*-maker sits in his own *sad*"—*i.e.* is punished by means of his own workmanship. If *stocks* is right here, Job "compares himself to a malefactor, at one time ([a]) held fast in the stocks, at another ([b]) narrowly watched, and ([c]) unable to pass beyond prescribed bounds" (Dr.).—*Soles*] Heb. *roots*. On Du.'s interpretation of [c], see phil. n.

28. The text, meaning and position of the v. have been questioned; but see phil. n.

XIV. 1–3. How strange (cp. 13[28]) that God should strictly call to account creatures so frail, shortlived, and (cp. 7[1–3]) full of unrest as man! The parallelism is better, if we render in [1a],

XIV. 1 Man that is born of woman
Is of few days, and full of trouble.
2 He cometh forth like a flower, and is cut down:
He fleeth also like a shadow, and continueth not.
3 And upon (one like) this dost thou open thine eyes,
And bring ⌜him⌝ into judgment with thee?
4 **Oh that a clean thing could come out of an unclean! not one (can).**
5 If his days are determined,
The number of his months is known to thee,
(And) his limit thou hast appointed that he cannot pass;
6 Look away from him, ⌜and⌝ forbear,
Till he can enjoy, as an hireling, his day.

Man is born of woman; or (Di.) $^{1.2}$, Man that is born of woman, Of few days, and full of trouble, Cometh forth . . ., Fleeth, etc. —*Born of woman*] of such frail origin.—*Of few days*] even a life of patriarchal length (42^{16}) may he regarded as brief (Gn. 47^{9}). —*Trouble*] $3^{17\,(n.)\,26}$.

2a. Cf. Ps. 90^{6} $103^{15f.}$, Is. $40^{6f.}$.—**b.** Cp. 8^{9} n.

3. Cp. $7^{17f.}$.

4. Cp. $4^{17f.}$, Ps. $51^{7\,(5)}$, and see phil. n.

5 f. If, as is the case ($^{1f.}$), man's life is brief, the fact is both known to and ordained by God; let God, then, desist (^{6a}) from His unkindly gaze (^{3}), that man may get at least some pleasure before his brief hard life is over.—*If*] the hypothetical is awkward: if correct, the whole of ^{5} may be protasis (so Di.); then render: If his days are determined, (And) the number of his months known, etc.—*His days*] 𝔊 + *upon earth*: rhythmically the line would admit, and indeed be improved by some addition; but something like *by thee* would be preferable.—*Known to*] Heb. *with*: see 9^{35} n.

6. *Look away from*] 7^{19} 10^{20} n.—*And forbear*] or *desist*, 7^{16} n. 𝔐 *That he may cease.*—*Till*] or: *to the point that* (עד as Is. 47^{7}; *Lex.* 725*b*, 3).—*An hireling*] a labourer hired by the day: $7^{1f.}$ n. —*His day*] *i.e.* the close of his life; at least let the evening of man's life be free from God's ill-treatment: cp. $10^{20f.}$.

7–10. The plea (^{6}) for some brief snatch of enjoyment before

7 For there *is* hope of a tree:
If it be cut down, it will sprout again,
And its shoots will not cease.
8 Though its root wax old in the earth,
And its stump die in the ground;
9 At the scent of water it will bud,
And put forth branches like a young plant.
10 But a man dieth, and ⌜passeth away⌝:
Yea, man giveth up the ghost, and where is he?
11 Waters fail from a lake,
And a river decayeth and drieth up;
12 And (so) man lieth down and riseth not:
Till the heavens be no more, they will not awake,
Nor be roused out of their sleep.

---

death is based on the impossibility of any enjoyment after death; man once dead, unlike a tree that is cut down, cannot be rejuvenated and start life again, but passes away for ever leaving no trace behind. There may be some reference here to specific, deliberate treatment of trees such as Wetzstein (in Del.) reports as customary on the east of Jordan, especially round Damascus; trees which through age begin to decay and to yield poor crops are cut down—close to the ground in the case of vines, figs, and pomegranates, and within a few feet of it in the case of the walnut; the next year new shoots spring from the root, and these subsequently bear fruit freely: all that is needed is what Job mentions as a *conditio sine qua non* —abundant water.

8. *Stump*] גזעו: Is. 11^{1} (see n. there).—*The ground*] Heb. *the dust*, as 5^{6}.

9. *At the scent of water*] cp. "As a string of tow is broken, when it scenteth the fire," Jg. 16^{9}.

10–12. Cp. 7^{7-10}.

11. = Is. 19^{5}; see phil. n.

12b, c. Man will *never* (cp. Ps. $72^{5.7.17}$ $89^{30.37f.}$) awake from the sleep of death.

13–15. Would that it were otherwise, and that God would make Sheol not a land of no remembrance to which in His

13 Oh that thou wouldest hide me in Sheol,
That thou wouldest keep me secret, until thy wrath turn,
That thou wouldest appoint me a limit, and remember me!
14 If a man die, will he live (again)?
All the days of my warfare would I wait,
Till my release should come:
15 Thou shouldest call, and *I* would answer thee:
Thou wouldest yearn after the work of thine hands.

---

anger He sends men for ever, but an asylum (provided by His love for His creatures, ^{15b}), while His wrath is abroad. If only it were certain that after a fixed period, God would remember Job (as He remembered Noah, the object of His grace, in the asylum of the ark, Gn. 8^1 P), and summon him back from Sheol and death; how willingly would Job wait, thus knowing that in the end life and friendly intercourse with God would be renewed. But there is no hope of such a future ($^{16-22}$ especially $^{19c-22}$). Thus Job here considers the idea, and the meaning if it were real, though he still dismisses the reality, of a future life of communion with God: previously ($7^{8.\,21}$) he has simply doubted the existence of such a future, without contemplating its significance if it were real.

13. *Turn*] cp. 9^{13}, Gn. $27^{44f.}$.

14. Line ^{a} is perhaps misplaced, or a marginal annotation. Even if rendered, as by Du. (see phil. n.), "If only a man might die, and live again," it forms a bad parallel to ^{13c}.—*Warfare*] 7^1 n.—*Release*] or relief from Sheol; the word appears to embody a military figure of one soldier or troop being replaced and so relieved by another (cp. on 10^{17}); but obviously the figure is not to be pressed.

15a. Cp. 13^{22a}, though the *figure* of that line is not repeated here.—*Yearn after*] cp. "seek diligently for," 7^{21} n.—*The work of thine hands*] cp. $10^{3.\,8-12}$.

16 f. Job has expressed the wish for a happier future in $^{13-15}$, *for* God's *present* attitude to him is so unfriendly and unforgiving that something different can but be desired, *but* ($^{18-22}$) that happy future of his hopes will not be realized. Such is the meaning and connection of the vv. as expressed in the above

16 For now thou numberest my steps:
Thou dost not ⌜pass⌝ over my sin.
17 My transgression is sealed up in a bag,
And thou fastenest up my iniquity.
18 But indeed a mountain falling crumbleth away,
And a rock is removed out of its place;
19 The waters wear the stones;
The overflowings thereof wash away the dust of the earth:
And (so) thou destroyest the hope of man.

---

translation. But it is not altogether natural, and much in the vv. is ambiguous: they have accordingly been by others understood to contain a continuation of the description in ^{15} of God's friendly attitude hoped for in the *future* (see phil. n.); but unfortunately this view, too, cannot conveniently be accommodated to the vv. throughout; if it were right we should expect in ^{17a} the impf. as in the other lines rather than the part. (חָתֻם).

16. *For now*] as 7^{21}: equally legitimate is the rendering *for then*; so 3^{13}.—*Thou numberest my steps*] watchest my movements to take account of the least slip: cp. 31^{4} (34^{21}) and for the thought, 13^{27}. If the vv. describe the future, it would be best to read (cp. 𝔖): For then thou wouldest *not* number my steps.—*Pass over*] so 𝔊; 𝔐 *watch over*, which would suit a description of the future; but to accommodate 𝔐 to a description of the present, the line must be translated interrogatively (possible, but awkward): "Dost thou not watch over my sin?"

17. Job's transgressions are recorded by God in a writing (cp. Jer. 17^{1}) which is bound and sealed up (cp. צור חתום, Is. 8^{16}).—*Sealed up*] for security in a bag (צרור) to be brought forth thence for punishment: cp. Hos. 13^{12} "Bound up (צרור) is the iniquity of Ephraim," Dt. 32^{34}.—*Fastenest up*] lit. plasterest (13^{4}) over: here, parallel to *is sealed up*, the phrase apparently means plasterest over with wax. Bu., who adopts the view that the vv. refer to the future, understands the figure to be that of giving a white appearance (cp. Is. 1^{18}) to (red) sin; the line then means that God forgives Job's sins.

18, 19. The emphatic words in ^{18} are *mountain* and *rock*: if even these mighty things come to destruction, how much more

20 Thou prevailest for ever against him, and he passeth;
Thou changest his countenance, and sendest him away.
21 His sons come to honour, and he knoweth it not;
And they are brought low, but he perceiveth them not.
22 Only his flesh upon him hath pain,
And his soul upon him mourneth.

(^{19c}) does man die without hope of living again! On ^{18a} see phil. n.; ^{18b} is cited in 18^{4}.—*But*] an emphatic adversative, which would be best explained by the view that the description of the desired but despaired of future extends down to ^{17}; but see on $^{16f.}$.

20. *Passeth*] away, dieth: so 10^{21}, 2 S. 12^{23}, Ec. 1^{4} 3^{20}, Ps. 39^{14}—a common sense of *halaka* in Arabic.—*Thou changest his countenance*] in death, when "Decay's effacing fingers, Have swept the lines where beauty lingers."

21. Dismissed (^{20b}) to Sheol, the dead no longer have knowledge (Ec. 9^{5}) even of what would, if they were alive on earth, most intimately concern them: cp. 22^{11}. Since from ^{18} and, in particular, ^{19c} onward, the direct personal reference is abandoned and the fate of man in general is depicted, ^{21} is not, of course, inconsistent with 1^{19} (the loss of Job's children).—*Are brought low*] come to dishonour: see phil. n.

22. Knowledge does not survive death: sentiency does: the dead man feels the pangs of decay, as the flesh still clothing him moulders away, and his soul can grieve for the dreary existence to which he is condemned in Sheol. Cp. Judith 16^{17b} "they shall weep at feeling," viz. the fire and worm sent into their decaying flesh: see also Is. 66^{24}.—*Upon him*] 10^{1} n. On various mistaken views of the phrase (such as: only so long as his flesh is upon does he feel pain; or, only for him does his flesh feel pain), see Di. or Bu.

XV. Eliphaz's second speech.—This, the opening speech of the second cycle, consists of a rebuke of the irreverent tone of Job's speeches, of his rejection of gentler correction, such as Eliphaz had offered in his previous speech (^{11}), and of his hard

XV. 1 Then answered Eliphaz the Temanite, and said,
2 Should a wise man answer with windy knowledge,
And fill his belly with the sirocco,
3 Arguing with unprofitable talk,
And with speeches, wherewith he can do no good?
4 Yea, *thou* doest away with fear,
And restrainest musing before God.

---

and obdurate temper ($^{1-14}$), leading up to the charge that he is wicked beyond the general unrighteousness of men ($^{14-16}$), and a warning picture of the dark and hopeless fate of the wicked ($^{17-35}$). The attitude of Eliphaz in his second is obviously severer than in his first speech: in the first he addresses Job as one who indeed fails to accept his sufferings with the patience which he had formerly recommended to others, but who is still held by religion (4^{6}); here, as one who is abandoning religion (15^{4}), and giving way to positive blasphemy ($^{5f.}$); in the first speech Eliphaz introduces the universality of human unrighteousness ($4^{13ff.}$), but not, as here ($^{14-16}$), to suggest that Job's wickedness exceeds it; and, again, in the first speech Eliphaz seeks to induce resignation in Job by his closing picture of the ultimate felicity of those who humbly receive suffering, while here he seeks to terrify Job out of what he now regards as his exceptional wickedness by a closing picture of the fate of the wicked.

2. Cp. 8^{2} 11^{2}.—*A wise man*] such as Job claims (12^{3} $13^{1f.}$) to be: it is less probable (see phil. n.) that Eliphaz asks whether he as a wise man should *make answer to* Job's words.—*Windy knowledge*] cp. 8^{2} 16^{3}.—*His belly*] whence, and not from the heart (8^{10}), the seat of understanding, words expressing windy knowledge are spoken.—*The sirocco*] violent (cp. 8^{2}) and hurtful (cp. 1^{19} n.).

3. *Arguing*] $13^{3.6}$: Job had desired to argue with God, but his words had been of no use: they had not helped to establish his case.

4. *Doest away with*] frustratest (5^{12}), annullest, destroyest. —*Fear*] of God, *i.e.* religion, as in 4^{6}. Line ^{b} is doubtless parallel to ^{a} and expresses the same general idea, viz. that Job has

5 For thine iniquity teacheth thy mouth,
And thou choosest the tongue of the crafty.
6 Thine own mouth condemneth thee, and not I;
And thine own lips testify against thee.
7 Wast thou the first one born a man?
Or wast thou brought forth before the hills?

---

become positively irreligious, [a] referring to inward sentiment, [b] perhaps to the outward observance of religion; but the exact meaning of both vb. and object is uncertain: *restrainest* should, perhaps, rather be *impairest*, *diminishest*: the vb. (גרע) means to *subtract* (as opposed to *add*—Dt. 4^{2}, Ec. 3^{14}, and in Nif. Nu. $36^{3f.}$), *withdraw* (v.[8] 36^{7} and, pointed Piel, 36^{27} (n.)), *diminish* (Ex. 21^{10}). The Nif. in Nu. 9^{7}, sometimes cited for the meaning *restrain*, means *to be withdrawn*: see n. there.—*Musing*] the noun (שיחה) occurs also in Ps. 119^{97} ("Thy law is (the subject of) my musing") [99] †: on the root see phil. n. on 7^{11}. Du. detects here a reference to the reverential silence required of worshippers (cp. Zec. 2^{17}, Hab. 2^{20}). Bu. renders [b]: And thou drawest *complaints* (שיחה as שיח in 7^{13} 9^{27} 10^{1} 21^{4} 23^{2}) before God.

5. Not (RVm.) *thy mouth teacheth thine iniquity*, *i.e.* your words show and prove that you are wicked: for this anticipates [6a], is against the usage of the vb. (יְאַלֵּף, 33^{33} 35^{11} †), and not favoured by the order of the words.—*Choosest the tongue of*] *i.e.* speakest like: Job, like the "crafty" serpent of Gn. $3^{1ff.}$, endeavours by what he says to misrepresent God.—*The crafty*] 5^{12}—the only other place in Job where the term is used—Gn. 3^{1}: in Pr.† the word is used with the good sense of *shrewd*, *wise*.

6. The v. is placed by Du. before [13].—*Thine own mouth condemneth thee*] 9^{20}.

7 f. But is Job so very wise (cp. [2a])? Is he the oldest, and so the wisest, of men? or does he attend God's council, and so possess wisdom withheld from other men [8]? Some such extravagant hypothesis would be required, if Job were really wiser than Eliphaz, the aged recipient of revelations. V.[8] is grammatically ambiguous (see phil. n.): it might mean, *Didst thou* in the past, or *dost thou* habitually in the present. Taking

8 Dost thou hearken in the council of God?
  And dost thou monopolize wisdom to thyself?
9 What knowest thou, that we know not?
  What understandest thou, which is not in our knowledge?
10 Among us are both the grey-headed and the aged,
  Older than thy father in days.

---

it in the former sense many see in ^{8} as well as ^{7} an allusion to the myth of a primeval man, older than creation: so Di. who compares the Indian Manu. In ^{7}, if ^{7b} be taken strictly, some such idea certainly seems to be present; unless with Bu. we see in ^{7} a reference to Pr. $8^{22ff.}$, and so take ^{7b} to mean: Art thou personified Wisdom itself?—*Brought forth before the hills*] Pr. 8^{25}: cp. Ps. 90^{2}. Du. *before the high ones* (גבהים for גבעת), *i.e.* the angels—unnecessarily.

8. *Dost thou*] or *didst thou*: see above.—*Council of God*] *i.e.* the circle of those admitted to intimacy with Him, especially the angels (Ps. $89^{8\,(7)}$, cp. 1 K. $22^{19ff.}$), but the council of Yahweh is also conceived as accessible to true prophets (Jer. 23^{22}).—*Monopolise*] lit. *withdraw* (see v.^{4} n.), *i.e.* withdraw (from others).

9 f. So far from having the wisdom of the most ancient, Job has no wisdom beyond that of the friends: and so far from being the most ancient of men, among them are men (or is a man) old enough to be Job's father.

9. Cp. 12^{2} 13^{2} (Job).—*In our knowledge*] lit. *with us*: see 9^{35} n.

10. The experience of age is on the side of the friends and against Job.—*Among us are*] unless the first pers. pl. in ^{9} and here has different meanings, the meaning is: among us three friends is, one of us three is: in that case the adjectives, which are in the singular, refer to an individual, and doubtless to Eliphaz who thus with conventional modesty refers to himself: then render, *Among us is one that is both grey-headed and aged, One that is older*, etc. Others have taken the phrase to mean: among us Temanites (Hi.), or among ourselves (Umbr.), or among people who share our opinions (Hgst.): then the singular adjectives should be taken collectively as above.

11 Are the consolations of God too small for thee,
  And a word (that dealeth) gently with thee?
12 Why doth thine heart carry thee away?
  And what do thine eyes hint at?
13 That thou turnest thy spirit against God,
  And lettest (such) words go out of thy mouth.
14 What is man, that he should be clean?
  And that one born of woman should be righteous?
15 Behold in his holy ones he putteth no trust,
  And the heavens are not clean in his sight.
16 How much less one that is abominable and tainted,
  A man that drinketh in unrighteousness like water.

---

11. Ought Job to have rejected as worthless and unadapted to his case Eliphaz's former gentle and (cp. especially $5^{17ff.}$) consolatory speech?—*The consolations of God*] Eliphaz feels that, since he is the recipient of revelations ($4^{12ff.}$), what he says is not merely his own, but God's speech: cp. 22^{22}; Job's sentiment is different (21^{2}).—*Gently*] see phil. n.: AV. RVm. erroneously give to לָאט the meaning *secret* (cp. בַּלָּאט, Jg. 4^{21} = בַּלָּט, 1 S. 18^{22}).

12 f. Why is Job so passionate as to turn his temper and speak against God: so, if the connection is right: between [12] and [13] Du. inserts [6], rendering [13] *For thou turnest*, etc.—*Hint at*] see phil. n.

13. *Spirit*] in the sense of passion or temper: cp. Jg. 8^{3}, Pr. 16^{32}.—*Lettest (such) words go*] or, emending, *bringest forth defiance*; cp. 23^{2} and see phil. n.

14 f. Varied from $4^{17f.}$; cp. also 9^{2b} $25^{4f.}$. In [14] the parallelism intended was perhaps of a. b | b′. a′ type (Gray, *Forms of Hebrew Poetry*, 64 f.), in which case render: What is man, that he should be clean, And (what) that he should be righteous, (is) one born of woman?—*One born of woman*] 14^{1} n.

15. *His holy ones*] the angels: cp. 4^{18}.—*The heavens*] cp. "moon . . . stars" in 25^{5}; and "the very heavens for purity" (לטהר; cp. יטהר, c. 4^{17}), Ex. 24^{10}.

16. The *a fortiori* after [15f.] is significantly different from 4^{19}: there, how impossible for frail, shortlived mortals to be pure

17 I will tell thee, hear thou me;
And that which I have seen I will relate;
18 (Which wise men do declare,
Without hiding it, from their fathers;
19 Unto whom alone the land was given,
And no stranger passed among them:)

---

in God's sight; here, how impossible for Job (cp. 34^{7}), who deliberately soaks himself with unrighteousness, to escape the fate of the wicked, which Eliphaz now proceeds to unfold ($^{17ff.}$). —*Drinketh . . . like water*] in great gulps, greedily like a thirsty man; cp. Ps. 73^{10}.

17–19. The vv., as a solemn introduction to the main theme of the speech, correspond to 4^{12-15} in Eliphaz's first speech: what Eliphaz is about to tell Job is the fruit of his own experience (^{17b}) during his long life (^{10}), confirming and confirmed by that of past generations (cp. 8^{8-10}, Bildad) who had dwelt in the land as a pure, unmingled community, undiluted by aliens, and so maintaining an uncontaminated tradition, a dogma of unimpeachable orthodoxy.

17. *Seen*] *i.e.* learnt, experienced: cp. 24^{1} 27^{12}.

18. *From their fathers*] having received it from their fathers.

19. It is tempting to infer from this v. some definite conclusion as to the date of the writer, but perhaps delusive; for it is not clear whether the writer intends by *the land*, the home of Eliphaz, viz. Teman, or Canaan (so Bu. Du.). If Canaan is intended, a contrast appears to be drawn between the present, when Canaan is not the sole possession of Israel and Israel is not an unmixed race, and a time in the past when Israel uncontaminated held Canaan unshared and by undisputed right; the event dividing the two periods has been held to be the Fall of Samaria (721 B.C.), and the settlement of foreigners in the Northern kingdom (cp. 2 K. $17^{24ff.}$), or the Exile of Judah (from 586 B.C.). Du. by precarious detailed arguments infers that Job is three or four generations removed from the pre-exilic "fathers," and that about the middle of the 5th cent. B.C. is accordingly the latest date for the poet. But all this falls to the ground if Del., as is possible, is right in feeling that

20 All the days of the wicked man, he travaileth with pain,
And the number of the years (that are) laid up for the tyrant.

21 A sound of terrors is in his ears;
In prosperity the spoiler will come upon him:

22 He believeth not that he will return out of darkness,
And he is ⌜reserved⌝ for the sword:

Eliphaz, in genuine Arab fashion, is merely boasting of the purity of his own tribe of Teman, and placing the origin of the doctrine he is about to proclaim back in a remote past when that purity of the tribe was still greater than now.—*The land*] not, here, *the earth*.—*Stranger*] of alien race; 19[15a] n.—*Passed among them*] passed to and fro among (בתוך) them, became one of them (Del. Bu.), rather than passed through them as an enemy (Di.)—the force of עבר ב in Nah. 2[1] (1[51]); cp. "And Jerusalem shall be holy, And aliens shall no more pass through it" (Jl. 4[17]).

20–35. The fate of the wicked.

20–24. Even while the wicked seem to prosper, they are in reality tormented by the expectation that misfortunes, such as are described in [21-24], will overtake them: such a theory—it is nothing more—helps to bolster up the orthodox dogma maintained by the friends that the wicked do not prosper: the apparent prosperity of the wicked, they argue, or rather assert, is not real; the happiness which their outward possessions might seem to ensure is destroyed by inward forebodings: far truer to life is the delineation of the temper of the prosperous in Lk. 12[19].—*The tyrant*] the parallel term to "wicked men" in [a]; and, therefore, virtually equivalent to *him*: but see phil. n. For the meaning of the term, see 6[23] n.

21. *Spoiler*] or *robber*, 12[6].

22. *Return out of darkness*] This should naturally mean: recover prosperity after the misfortunes of his forebodings have befallen him: we should rather expect (cp. [23b]), even if it were necessary to read סור for שוב, *avoid darkness*, *i.e.* misfortune: he has no hope of escaping from misfortune, whether that take the form of violent death ([22b]), or ([23a]) being reduced to beggary.

23 He wandereth abroad for bread, (saying), "Where is it?"
He knoweth that the day of darkness is ready at his hand:
24 Distress and anguish affright him;
They prevail against him, as a king ready for the fray:
25 Because he hath stretched out his hand against God,
And behaveth himself proudly against the Almighty;
26 He runneth upon him with a (stiff) neck,
With the thick bosses of his shield;

---

23. Possibly [22b. 23b] have been transposed; adopting emendations noticed in the phil. n., we might then read:

[22] He believeth not that he will avoid the darkness,
[23b] He knoweth that his calamity is ready;
[23a] He is wandering abroad for bread (saying), "Where is it?"
[22b] And he is reserved for the sword.
[24] The day of darkness affrighteth him,
Distress and anguish prevail against him.

The last clause of [24] is then the third stichos of a tristich unless we place it after [26a] (cp. Du.), to which it would form an admirable parallel.

24. *Prevail against*] 14[20].—*As a king ready for the fray*] irresistibly: though the *king* is not necessarily more irresistible than any other warrior, cp. Pr. 6[11] "Thy poverty shall come . . . and thy want as a man with a shield."

25–28. The conduct of the wicked, tyrannical ([20b]) man is described as the ground of his fate as just sketched: [29] would follow [24] quite well, and Sgf. Be. Bu. omit [25-28]—not quite necessarily.

25 f. He has been defiantly hostile to God.—*Behaveth himself proudly*] or mightily, playeth the, or acteth as a, warrior (יתגבר): cp. Is. 42[13] "Yahweh will go forth as a mighty man . . . he will act mightily against his enemies": c. 36[9] "He declareth to them their transgressions, that they behave themselves proudly (or mightily)."

26. *With a* (*stiff*) *neck*] or, emending, *as a warrior* (cp. Is. 42[13]; see last n.) to which "as a king," etc., would be the parallel term if [24bβ] originally followed [26a].—*Bosses*] 13[12] n.

27 Because he hath covered his face with his fatness,
And made collops of fat on his loins;
28 And he hath dwelt in effaced cities,
In houses which no man should inhabit,
Which were destined to become heaps.
29 He becometh not rich, neither doth his substance endure,
Neither do his ears (of corn) bend to the earth.
30 He departeth not out of darkness.
His shoots the flame drieth up,
And his ⌜bud⌝ is ⌜swept away⌝ by the wind.

---

27. Grown rich and prosperous, he has become confirmed in his insensibility to God and all that is spiritual: for this figurative use of fatness, cp. Dt. 32^{15}, Jer. 5^{28}, Ps. 73^{7} 119^{70}.

28. Being indifferent to God (^{27}), he builds up and inhabits sites which have been reduced to ruins by some judgment of God, and on which accordingly the curse of God rests, virtually carrying with it a decree of God that such places are not to be rebuilt (cp. Jos. 6^{26}, 1 K. 16^{34}, Dt. 13^{17}). Lines $^{a.b}$ give a complete distich which is not improved by being transformed into a tristich by the addition of ^{c}. Du., rather precariously appealing to 𝔊 (see phil. n.), takes ^{28c} (reading התעתד אחרים ישאו) with ^{29a}: What he hath prepared others will take away, And his substance does not endure.

29. The statements in ^{a} are, strictly speaking, inconsistent, for the second implies that the man does acquire *substance*, or wealth (חיל, 31^{25}), though he does not retain it. Possibly the first negative is due to error, and the line originally ran: He becometh rich, but his wealth endureth not—a sentence of the same type as 8^{15}. On line ^{b}, which is also questionable, see phil. n.

30. Line ^{a}—an isolated stichos—looks like a variant of ^{22a}. —**b. c.** The wicked man may be rich and prosperous (cp. ^{29a} n.), resembling a flourishing plant (cp. $8^{16f.}$) which gives promise of fruit, but his wealth as suddenly vanishes as a tree ruined by lightning or wind.—*Shoots*] 8^{16} 14^{7}. Line ^{c} in 𝔐 reads, And he departeth not with (or, by means of) the breath of his mouth, which is obviously corrupt, see phil. n.

31 Let him trust not in emptiness, deceiving himself:
For emptiness will be his return for what he doeth.
32 ⌜His palm-branch⌝ is ⌜cut off⌝ before its time,
And his palm-frond luxuriates no more.
33 He wrongeth, like the vine, his unripe grape,
And casteth off, like the olive, his flower.

---

31. This v., too, in 𝔐 is questionable, but satisfactory emendation is not forthcoming. The meaning, if 𝔐 is correct, appears to be: "his vanity (*i.e.* emptiness), in the sense of frivolity or worldliness, brings as its reward 'vanity' in the sense of what is worthless or disappointing" (Dr.). Between ^{30} and $^{32f.}$ (all figures from plant life), ^{31} may well be out of place (Be. Bu. Du. Peake), unless this v. also in its original form referred to plant life: Richter's attempt, however, to recover such an original is unhappy.—*Emptiness*] 7^{8} n.—*His return for what he doeth*] lit. *his exchange*: cp. 20^{18} 28^{17}.

32a. Or (see phil. n.) emending otherwise, it (viz. the shoots of ^{30a}) is cut off before its time. 𝔐, which though improbable has found defenders, reads, Before his time it—which is taken to refer to "his return" in ^{31} (Di.), or to mean "his fate" (Bu., if 𝔐 were correct)—is fulfilled.—*Before his time*] lit. *on not his day*, *i.e.* on a day not, but earlier than, that on which he would normally have died—not at the end of his days, but in the midst of his days: cp. Ps. $55^{24\,(23)}$.

33. The wicked man, since he never really enjoys any prosperity he may appear to possess or sees promise of success fulfilled, is like a vine that produces grapes indeed, but grapes that never ripen; or like the olive that produces a profusion of flowers, most of which, however, do not set into fruit even in the alternate year in which the olive bears: "every second year, though it bloom, it scarcely produces any berries at all": see Wetzst. in Del., and Thomson, *The Land and the Book*, 54 f. —*He wrongeth*] by failing to mature; cp. of the sinner. "He that sinneth against me wrongeth his own soul," Pr. 8^{36}. The paraphrase of the Heb. in 𝔗 EV. ("shaketh off") is false to nature: the vine does not cast its unripe berries, but "the unriper the berries, the faster they stick" (Del.).

34 For the company of the godless is sterile;
  And fire devoureth the tents of bribery.
35 They conceive mischief, and bring forth misfortune;
  And their belly prepareth disappointment (for themselves).

---

34. The whole class of the wicked is like sterile ground producing no crops: the whole class furnishes no example of a really, permanently successful man.—*Company*] cp. similarly Ps. $22^{17\,(16)}$ and 86^{14}; it does not here mean *family* (Del.), even though that meaning could be established for 16^{7}.—*Godless*] 13^{16} 8^{13} n.—*Sterile*] 3^{7} n.—*Fire*] one of the causes of Job's calamities (1^{16}) to which fact there is perhaps an oblique allusion here: cp. 20^{26} (Ṣophar), 22^{20} (Eliphaz).—*The tents of bribery*] the homes of those who have grown rich by accepting bribes (cp. Is. 1^{23}), or have used their riches to bribe judges and pervert justice in their own interest: bribery is obviously selected as typical of gross sins.

35. Cp. Is. 59^{4} 33^{11}, Ps. $7^{15\,(14)}$.—*Mischief . . . misfortune*] 4^{8} n. 3^{10} n.—*Belly*] *i.e.* womb, as 3^{11}. Others (Del.) take *belly* here of the entire inward nature of man, including thought, feeling, and will (cp. Pr. 18^{8} $20^{27.\,30}$ 22^{18}), which would suit the vb. (*prepareth*), but would involve the abandonment of the figure in ^{a}.

XVI. XVII. Job's reply to Eliphaz's second speech.—Like his previous replies, this speech also is only in part (most clearly in 16^{2-5} and, perhaps, 17^{10}) directly addressed to the friends. In $17^{3f.}$ (in 𝔊 also in ^{6}) God is addressed, and in 16^{18} earth is apostrophized. But more of this than of the previous replies is in the strain of musing or monologue; so $16^{6-17.\,20-22}$ $17^{1f.\,5-9.\,11-17}$ are not obviously addressed either to the friends or to God, and 16^{20} is obviously not addressed to either. Opening with a brief and contemptuous dismissal of the comfort offered by the friends (16^{1-5}), Job passes on to describe God's violent treatment of him ($^{7-16}$), in spite of his innocence ($^{17f.}$). And yet God is his witness and vindicator (^{18}–17^{3}); and accordingly, with death imminent, to Him and not to the friends he appeals (16^{20} 17^{4}). But from this bold appeal to

XVI. 1 Then Job answered and said,
2 I have heard many such things:
Troublesome comforters are ye all.
3 Shall windy words have an end?
Or what provoketh (?) thee that thou answerest?
4 I also could speak as ye do,
If your soul were in my soul's stead;
I could join words together against you,
And shake mine head at you:

God against God, he returns to describe further God's harsh treatment of him, and his hopeless outlook (17^{6-16}).

2–5. Job contemptuously rejects the commonplaces (^{2a}) which Eliphaz (^{3b}), merely repeating what he and the others (^{2b}) had said in their previous speeches, has just uttered. Instead of being silent, as Job had begged them to be (13^5), what makes Eliphaz speak at all, if this is all he has to offer (^{3})? He and his friends may have come to comfort him, but so far from doing so (cp. 21^{34}) in reality (cp. 13^4), they add to his trouble by forcing upon him conventional words of comfort, not springing from their hearts. How easily and how abundantly could Job, if their parts were reversed, let loose on them like words, and give them support of the same kind!

2. *I have heard such things*] already from you and your two companions; and what they say has already been stigmatized as commonplace (12^3).—*Troublesome comforters*] not conveying, as Eliphaz had claimed, the comforts of God (15^{11}), but comforters (cp. 2^{11}) of, *i.e.* who cause to me, trouble (עמל, 3^{10} n.).—*Are ye all*] Eliphaz, whom very exceptionally (cp. 12^7 26^2 n.) in ^{3b} he addresses by himself, is no better than the other two.

3a. A retort to 15^2.—*Provoketh*] see phil. n.

4. If the circumstances of Job and the friends were reversed, Job could (not "would"), only too easily and as vainly, have spoken like the friends; what Job actually had done, and would have done again for sufferers like himself, was very different; for his words had really comforted, restored, and strengthened ($4^{3f.}$ Eliphaz, 29^{12-16} Job). **b.** Or, *If only your soul were in my soul's stead!* (see phil. n.): would that ye could

[5] I could strengthen you with my mouth,
And ⌜not⌝ restrain the solace of my lips.
[6] If I speak, my pain is not restrained:
And if I forbear, how much (of it) departeth from me?

---

look at and judge your comfort from the position of the sufferer.—*Join words together*] or, *make fine speeches* (see phil. n.), thinking more of my own skill than your need.—*Shake mine head at*] the gesture is mentioned in cases in which mocking or satirical words are added or implied: Ps. 22[8] (cp. the || הלעיג, and the words of [9]), Is. 37[22] (|| הלעיג, בזה), Ecclus. 12[18], Mt. 27[39] (cp. [40]).

5. The irony of [4] is continued; mere lip comfort is easily given. **b.** 𝔐, And the solace of my lips should restrain (*sc.* your pain: cp. [6]); then [b], and in that case [a] too, would be more naturally taken seriously, not ironically; but, if [5] expressed what Job would actually do, in contrast to [4] what he could, but would not, do, a strong adversative would be required at the beginning of [5]: RV. accordingly supplies *But*; this is, however, virtually an emendation, and a bad one, for if Job had been turning from irony to a statement of what he would actually do, he would not lay stress on *mouth* and *lips* (cp. 11[2] n.).—*Not restrain*] or, emending otherwise, "*encourage you with*"; the translation above follows 𝔊 (see phil. n.).

6. Alike whether Job speaks or keeps silence, his pain is in no way alleviated. The connection is not obvious, and "speak" is rather ambiguous; it is commonly taken (Di.) to mean: If I speak to my friends, I get no comfort from them; I may as well, therefore, keep silence; but that course, too, does not ease me. But a comparison with 7[11] 10[1] suggests that it may mean: If I say to and of God what I think about His treatment of me, it is true He remains deaf to my appeals, and I get no alleviation, neither do I, however, when I keep silence; therefore, I will repeat my case against Him.

7–16. In the tone of a soliloquy, Job describes the condition to which God in His hostility has reduced him.

7. *He*] The subject is God, unnamed (cp. 3[20] n.) till [11]; not Eliphaz (for [7] and [8] are closely connected, and [8b], in any case,

[7] Only now he hath wearied me out, (and) appalled ⌜me⌝,
⌜And⌝ all my ⌜calamity⌝ hath seized hold upon me.
[8] It hath been a witness and risen up against me;
My leanness testifieth to my face!

---

refers to a visitation of God), nor "my pain" (𝔙).—*(And) appalled me and all my calamity hath seized hold upon me*] see phil. notes. 𝔐 *Thou hast appalled*, or *laid waste* (EV. "made desolate") *all my company* (so 𝔐), or (𝔖) *all my testimony*, *i.e.* all that testifies to me, my good fortune (?), or (Ehrlich), *all that I testify*, *i.e.* my arguments, [8] *and thou hast seized hold upon me.* The address in [7b. 8a], if 𝔐 were correct, must be to God, but the transition from the 3rd pers. in [7a] to the 2nd in [7b. 8a] and back to the 3rd in [9] would be very awkward. "Thou hast laid waste all my company" in 𝔐 is supposed to mean that God has changed the entire circle of the adherents, house-mates, and friends of Job into his enemies (Di. Da.), and so left Job deserted and alone; but to speak of alienating a man's friends as a "laying waste," not of himself but of them, is very strange: nor perhaps would the estrangement of Job's friends (19^{13-19}) be quite naturally referred to here. For the use of "company" in 𝔐, cp. 15^{34}.

8. All this misfortune testifies, on the current theory of prosperity and adversity, to Job's guilt; cp. 10^{17}.—*My leanness*] cp. Ps. 109^{24}: see phil. n.

9–14. In vv.[9a. b. 12-14] we have *figurative* descriptions of the treatment measured out to Job by God (the unnamed subj., as already in [7a (7b)], of vbs. in the *sing.*); in [10] description of the treatment of Job by human adversaries—the unnamed subjects of vbs. in the *plural*: [11] states that God delivers Job up into the power of such human adversaries. Thus the present order of the vv. is anything but natural. Wr. places [11] before [10], Peake before [9c] (reading the noun, vbs., and 3rd pers. in the pl.), and this would relieve the more serious difficulty. Sgf. deletes [10f.], Du. [9c-11] allowing the figures of [9a. b] to be continued uninterrupted by [12]. The omission of [10a] only (𝔊) does not ease the difficulty; and the insertion before [9c] in 𝔊 of the line (cp. 6^4), "The arrows of his troops have fallen upon me," only

9 His wrath hath torn me, and with hatred pursued me;
He hath gnashed upon me with his teeth:
Mine adversary sharpeneth his eyes upon me;
10 They have gaped upon me with their mouth;
They have smitten my cheeks reproachfully;
One and all they mass themselves against me.
11 God delivereth me to the unrighteous,
And casteth me headlong into the hands of the wicked.
12 I was at ease, and he hath cleft me asunder;
He hath taken hold of my neck, and dashed me to pieces.

---

partially: it would account for plurals in $^{10b.\ c}$ (𝕳, but not 𝕲), but hardly for the vbs. used: for the treatment described in these lines is scarcely that of those who composed God's (superhuman) troops, but far rather of such terrors as those mentioned in ^{11}.

9a, b. Yahweh, or specifically His anger, is figured as a wild beast tearing (טרף as Gn. 37^{33}, Ex. 22^{12}, and frequently in figures, *e.g.*, Dt. 33^{20} and, as here, of God, Hos. 5^{14}) its prey. The figure is continued in ^{12}: see last n.—*With hatred pursued me*] or, transposing two letters, *dropped me*, *i.e.* from his mouth to the ground, which maintains the figure.—**c.** *Mine adversary*] No doubt Job might so have termed God, though צר is not exactly the term suggested by the passages (9^{3} $10^{2.\ 17}$ $13^{19ff.}$) to which Bu. appeals; but it would be curious that the expressed subject should appear first in the *third* line of the tristich ($9^{a.\ b.\ c}$ being on this view a tristich). But ^{9c} is preferably taken as forming with ^{10a} a distich; and the adversary, or rather the adversaries (*pl.*) are human: in this case read with 𝕾: *Mine adversaries sharpen their eyes.*

10. Cp. $30^{1.\ 9f.\ 12ff.}$.—*Gaped . . . with their mouth*] in derision; cp. Ps. $22^{14\ (13)}$, Is. 57^{4}.—*Smitten my cheek*] cp. Mic. 4^{14}, La. 3^{30}, Mt. 5^{39}.

11. *The wicked*] 𝕸 *children*: see phil. n.

12a, b. If $^{9c-11}$ be an interpolation, this v. continues the figure of the wild beast in $^{9a.\ b}$, completing a quatrain devoted to it.—*Cleft me asunder*] or *mangled*, or *clawed*, *me* (see the phil. n.).

12c, 13. A fresh figure to which also a quatrain is devoted:

He hath also set me up for his mark;
13 His archers compass me round about;
He cleaveth through my reins, and doth not spare;
He poureth out my gall upon the ground.
14 He breaketh me with breach upon breach;
He runneth upon me like a warrior.
15 Sackcloth have I sewed upon my skin,
And I have laid my horn in the dust.

God is an archer (so, *e.g.*, Ps. $64^{8 (7)}$), Job the butt (cp. La. 3^{12}) for His arrows.—*Archers*] unless the word may be rendered *arrows* (see phil. n.), God is now in ^{13a} represented as a commander (so also implicitly 19^{12}) of archers (rather than, as in ^{12c}, actually Himself shooting), by means of whose shooting, rather than by arrows shot by His own hand, He pierces Job's vital parts.—*He cleaveth through my reins*] cp. "until an arrow cleave through his liver," *i.e.* till he is mortally wounded, Pr. 7^{23}; "He (God) hath caused the shafts of his quiver to enter into my reins," La. 3^{13}.—*He poureth out my gall*] cp. "My liver is poured out on the ground," La. 2^{11}. Cp. also the reference to the gall-bladder in c. 20^{25}.

14. Another fresh figure—this time developed in a single distich: God is a warrior engaged in breaching a fortified city, Job the city in whose walls breach after breach is made.—*Breaketh*] or *makes a breach in*; so with acc. of the fence or wall, Is. 5^{5}, Ps. 80^{13} 89^{41} (note the ||), Neh. 3^{35}; for the noun of a *breach* in a wall, see 30^{14}, Am. 4^{3}, 1 K. 11^{27}.—*He runneth upon me*] cp. 15^{26}; also (if we there read גדר for גדוד) Ps. $18^{30 (29)}$: "For by thee I run up to a fence, and by my God I leap over a wall."—*Warrior*] גבור, not *giant* (EV.): cp. 1 S. 2^{4}, 2 S. 23^{8}, Pr. 16^{32}, Is. 13^{3} 21^{17} etc., and, as here, figuratively of God, Is. 42^{13} (|| "man of war").

15 f. Resuming ^{6}, Job describes his miserable condition resulting from God's hostility, $^{7-14}$. He has ^{15a} sewn together a garment of *sak*, and now wears it next his skin (cp. 1 K. 21^{27}, 2 K. 6^{30}), or, perhaps, the precise implication of the line is rather, the sackcloth never leaves me (Ehrlich). Job's wearing of sackcloth, a frequently mentioned sign of grief or mourning

16 My face is red with weeping,
And on my eyelids is thick darkness;
17 Although there is no violence in my hands,
And my prayer is pure.
18 O earth, cover not thou my blood,
And let my cry have no (resting) place.

(cp. Is. 22[12]), is not referred to in the Prologue, but it is the normal sequel to the rending or removal of the garments (1[20]) worn by the persons in question (cp. Gn. 37[34], 1 K. 21[27], 2 K. 19[1], Jon. 3[6]).—*Laid my horn in the dust*] a fig. of complete humiliation; so, "to exalt the horn" is to lift into a position of pride and dignity. The fig. is often supposed to be derived from the bull, whose strength and pride lie in its horns: for another explanation, see phil. n.

16b. Darkness is already settling on Job's eyebrows and will soon close them in death; or, as others think, [a] refers to the watering of the eyes which is a symptom of elephantiasis, and [b] to the loss of sight consequent on the weeping.

17. There has been no moral justification for God's reducing Job to such misery. Cp. 10[7]. The v. is scarcely, as it is often said to be, a contradiction of Eliphaz's charge in 15[4f.]: Eliphaz there charges Job with *sins of speech about God* in the course of the discussion; what Job here denies is violence of *deed* in [17a], and in [b], if the text be correct, insincere speech *to* God. But [17b] is a curious parallel to [a]; like [a] it may perhaps originally have repudiated insincere or deceptive speech towards men (cp. Is. 53[9]), or (with נתיבתי, *my way* (Du.?), or התהלכתי, *my walking*, course of life (Be.) for "my prayer") have contained a reference to conduct in general.

18-21. About to die an undeserved ([17]) death, Job passionately appeals for the vindication of his innocence after death ([18]), and, though it is God who will inflict the undeserved death, it is God to whom he looks to vindicate him ([19]) both against Himself ([21a]), who by the sufferings which He has inflicted has seemed to represent Job as wicked, and against his fellow-men ([21b]), who have definitely charged him with wickedness.

18. When he is dead, let his assertion of innocence and his

19 Even now, behold, my witness is in heaven,
And he that voucheth for me is on high.
20 My friends are my scorners:
Unto God mine eye droppeth (tears);

---

call for vengeance on his murderer go on ringing up to heaven; let his blood lie uncovered that its voice may not be gagged with the dust of the grave, and let the cry of his blood find no tarrying place as it travels up to heaven. By a special development of the widespread belief in the dangers generated by shed blood (cp. BLOOD, § 2, in *ERE*), Hebrew folklore taught that such blood, so long as it lay on the ground uncovered and unabsorbed, or if, having been covered over, it was again laid bare, cried out to God for vengeance: cp. Gn. 4^{10}, Is. 26^{21} and, especially, Ezk. 24^{6-9} with its emphasis on the unabsorbent rock in contrast with the ground in general (ארץ), which would have been more absorbent: Woe to the bloody city . . . for the blood she has shed is in her midst, on the bare rock she has (or, with 𝕲, I have) set it: she poured it not out upon the earth, so as to cover it over with dust; (but) in order to arouse fury, that vengeance might be taken, I have put the blood she has shed upon the bare rock, so that it might not be covered. Thus the double aspect (cp. 7^{21} n.) under which Job apprehends God at this stage is clear and striking: God is his murderer; but Job's blood, shed by Him, will cry not in vain to heaven; for there it will find a vindicator, and that vindicator will be—God. Ehrlich's explanation, on the basis of Talmudic usage, is singularly improbable: according to him the meaning is: O earth, let my blood—by which is meant the injustice done him by his opponents representing him as a sinner—cry to heaven, so that I have no need to cry out myself.

19. *On high*] or, *in the heights*—a synonym for heaven, as 25^2 31^2.

20. Job's friends scorn him for his sufferings; he turns his tear-stained face to God with the plea which follows in [21]; so or similarly the v. is understood on the supposition that 𝕳 is correct, and that [a] is to be translated as above. If 𝕳 is correct, the above translation, which follows 𝕸, is the least improbable;

21 That he would decide for a man (in his contest) with God,
And between a son of man and his neighbour.
22 For a few years will come,
And (then) I shall go the way by which I shall not return.

---

but it could also be, and has by some been, translated in various other ways: My friend, or (Hoffm.) my shepherd (*i.e.* God), is my scorner (or, translating מליץ as in 33^{23}, my interpreter); or, they that mock me are friends of God (Wr.); or, my thoughts (or, aims; see Ps. $139^{2.17}$ †) are my interpreters (Ehrlich). 𝔊 presupposes a better parallelism and a better rhythm: it renders,

May my prayer come unto God,
Before him mine eye droppeth (tears).

21. Dependent on the sense of petition expressed in [20]—indirectly in [b], and perhaps originally directly in [a]: My prayer is that my witness in heaven ([19]) would secure my right (ויוכח: cp. 9^{33}, Is. 11^{4}), be the arbitrator whom I have longed for (9^{33}), in my contest with God.—*Man, son of man*] are simply parallel terms: cp. Ps. $8^{5(4)}$; the general term in each case refers specifically to Job; for the "and" can scarcely, with Ehrlich, be taken as the "and" of comparison (cp. phil. n.), so that the v. would mean: that God may secure right for Job in his dispute with God, *as* (He is wont to decide justly) between a man and his neighbour (cp. 1 S. 2^{25}).—*His neighbour*] or, friend: in this latter sense the term in the pl. is applied to Job's three friends (2^{11} 19^{21}): the sing. here does not refer to Eliphaz (Peake) in particular, but obliquely (as "man" to Job) to all three friends, the sing. being chosen as common in such phrases (cp. *e.g.* Jer. 7^{5}). Another mistaken view of the sing. is that it is a synonym for God (Du.); but there is no reason for the choice of such a strange term for God (note the *antithesis* between God and a man's neighbour in Ex. 33^{11} and in [20] if the text there be correct), for if [b] had been an exact repetition of the thought of [a] the writer could, according to his usual practice, have used in [b] an alternative name for God (אל or שדי).

22–XVII. 2. Job gives as the ground for the wish just expressed his conviction of the near approach of death.

22. This v. appears to say: only a few more *years* of life

XVII. [1] My spirit is broken,
My days are extinct,
The grave is (ready) for me.
[2] Surely there is mockery beside me,
And mine eye abideth in their defiance.

---

remain to me, whereas the next (17^1) naturally suggests that Job regards his life as already virtually at an end; thus the two vv. do not go well together. Further, if both verses alike contain a reason either why God should intervene *speedily*, or why Job must make his plea *without delay*, it seems out of place to speak of *years* of life, even though but a few years, yet to come. Either [22] is out of place (Sgf.), or we must emend in such a way that [22] like 17^1 implies that death is imminent (see phil. n.).—*A few years*] lit. "years of number," the idiom being the same as in "a few men," Gn. 34^{30}, Dt. 4^{27} etc.

22b. Cp. 10^{21a}.

XVII. 1. See phil. n.—*My spirit is broken*] *i.e.* my life (𝔗 my soul) is destroyed; death is more commonly described as the departure (Ec. 12^7, Ps. 104^{29} 146^4), and in Is. 57^{16} as an enfeeblement, of the spirit. AV. "My breath is corrupt," but the vb. does not mean "is fetid," and, even if it did, a reference here to Job's fetid breath (19^{17}) would not agree either with the parallel lines or the context.

2. The v. is very strangely phrased, and is probably corrupt. Apparently Job returns to the charge against the friends in 16^{20} 𝔐 (but see n. there), alluding, as Dr. puts it, "to his friends' illusory promises of restoration (*e.g.* 5^{17-26}), and exasperating insinuations of his guilt" (*e.g.* 8^{3-6} $11^{4-6. 20}$: cp. $12^{4f.}$). So Di., who also mentions and criticizes numerous other untenable suggestions. Du., reading *bitternesses* in [b] instead of *their defiance*, understands *mockery* in [a] of the constant disappointment of Job's hopes (cp. [13a]), and "bitternesses" in [b] of the bitter conditions imposed on him by God.—*Surely there is . . . and*] the rendering, in itself legitimate, *if there is not . . . then* yields no appropriate sense: for אם לא, *surely*, cp. 31^{36}, *Lex.* 50*b*.—*Beside me*] the mockery of my friends, or of fortune, surrounds (עם, as $29^{6. 20}$ 25^2), or is in conflict with (עם, as

3 Lay down, I pray thee, the pledge for me with thyself;
Who (else) is there that will strike his hand in to mine?
4 For their heart hast thou hid from understanding:
Therefore thou wilt not exalt them.
5 He that denounceth (his) friends for a prey,
Even the eyes of his children shall fail.

10^{17} n.) me.—*Abideth in*] or, emending, faileth by reason of (see phil. n.).

3. Addressing himself now to God, Job, even more clearly than in 16^{20-22}, sets over against one another his two thoughts of God—God hostile and God friendly, God unjustly making him suffer and so taking away his character, and God able and ultimately willing to re-establish his character; or, in the terms of the present figure, God as the giver of the pledge or bail which releases Job, and God as the receiver of the bail who, till He receives it, holds Job a prisoner (cp. 13^{27}). He does not expect immediate vindication, else no need of bail, nor even in this life (cp. 19^{25-27}).

3b. There is no one else who can give this pledge to clear him from God's aspersions, alike before God and man (16^{21}), but God Himself.—*Strike his hand*] *i.e.* make the gesture that accompanies the giving of a pledge: cp. Pr. 6^1 17^{18}.

4. The friends, who might naturally have gone surety for Job's innocence, will not do so, because God has deprived them of the power of seeing the true state of the case, and consequently they believe Job guilty. But since this conclusion of theirs is due to blindness, God who is not blind, but sees aright, cannot exalt them to the position of victors in their dispute with Job by allowing Job's innocence to remain permanently unvindicated. Such is commonly taken to be the connection. Du. thinks the v., which 𝔊 omits, due to an interpolator mindful of $42^{7ff.}$, but unmindful of the immediate context.

5. It is probable that the text of ^{a} is hopelessly corrupt (so Sgf.), and that this accounts for the fact that all attempts to explain the v. either suffer from artificiality, or place on the words of the text a questionable meaning. *Denounceth*, or

informeth against, is the only meaning that can safely be placed on הגיד, construed with an acc. of the pers. (see phil. n.); there is no justification in usage for rendering *inviteth*, and *speaketh to* (AV.) is not to be supported by reference to 26[4] (see n. there), 31[37] (acc. of the *suffix*), 2 S. 15[31] (see Dr. *ad loc.*), and scarcely even by 2 K. 7[9. 11], Ezk. 43[10]. *Prey* (RV.) is a unique rendering of חֵלֶק, which is commonly rendered *portion*, or *share*, and may refer to, *inter alia*, a *portion* of spoil or booty (Gn. 14[24], 1 S. 30[24]), or of food (Hab. 1[16]), or of land (Jos. 19[9] and often); so the vb. חלק usually means *to divide*, *apportion* (spoil, food, land, etc.); but in 2 Ch. 28[21] it has virtually developed the meaning *to plunder*, an exceptional meaning of the vb. which supplies some ground for the sense "prey" given to the noun here (Ew. reaches much the same meaning in another way). *Flattery* (AV.) is, in itself, also a legitimate rendering of חלק (cp. Pr. 7[21]). Literally rendered, according to the usual meaning of the words, the v. thus reads: *For a portion one denounceth friends, and the eyes of his children fail*; "his" in [b] refers to "one" in [a]; "his" in [a] (RV.) is not expressed in Hebrew. The following may be given as the principal efforts to impose a meaning on these words and to connect them with their context. 1. Dr., retaining RV. without alteration, comments: "Job compares his friends (implicitly) to a man who heartlessly distrains (as we should say) the goods of a neighbour for debt, and whose children suffer for their father's cruelty." On this theory the v. is at once a charge and a threat: the friends of Job are cruel; the children of the cruel suffer; therefore their children will suffer—a curious threat for Job to make, for see 21[19f.]. Hgst. makes the whole v. a threat, rendering, *A prey (becometh) he who denounceth friends, And the eyes of his children fail.* 2. Ew. al. (cp. Di.) take the whole v. as descriptive, thus avoiding the threat; [b] is then treated as circumstantial; and the *sing.* pron. in [b] is taken to refer not to the denouncer, but to the friends (plural) denounced; for such *enallage numeri* Di. refers to 18[5] 24[5. 16f.] 27[23]; and Ew. accounts for it here by the fact that while using the pl. with a general reference in [a], Job is all the time thinking of himself: he renders, *for allotting*, *i.e.*

6 He hath made me a byword of the peoples;
And as one at whom men spit must I be.
7 Mine eye also is dim by reason of vexation,
And all my members are as a shadow.

---

that the lot may be cast for them as for prisoners, *one denounces friends, while the eyes of his* (*i.e.* the friends') *children fail.* In this case as ^{4} describes the folly, so ^{5} the ruthlessness of the friends of Job, both vv. giving motives for the request in ^{3} (Di.). 3. Bu. (cp. Peake) treats the v. as a proverb (hence the 3rd pers. sing.), *one invites friends to share* (*one's table*), *while his own children's eyes fail* (from starvation), applied to the friends who, actually bereft of wisdom (^{4}), yet think they can impart a rich share of their wisdom to Job. This explanation is less forced than the preceding, but it really requires יקרא instead of יגיד. 4. Du. also treats the v. as a proverb, and, regarding it as a marginal note not needing to be closely related to the context, renders: *He who denounces friends on account of a pledge, his children's eyes fail.*

6 ff. Resumed description of God's hard treatment of Job.

6. *He*] *i.e.* God: perhaps, *And thou hast made* should be read (see phil. n.).—*A byword of the peoples*] Job comes to rank among neighbouring peoples, to whom the story of his sufferings spreads, as a great sinner, so that they say "as great a sinner as Job": cp. 30^9, and for similar phrases, Dt. 28^{27}, 1 K. 9^7, Jer. 24^9.—*As one at whom men spit*] *i.e.* an object of aversion (see phil. n.): 𝔊 *a portent before them*, perhaps rightly: AV. aforetime (as) *a tabret*, confusing תפת with תף.

7a. Cp. 16^{16}, Ps. 6^8.—*Vexation*] at God's undeserved treatment of him: cp. 6^2.—**b.** He has grown lean with suffering: cp. 16^8.

8–10. If these vv. are in their right place, Job is asserting, in contradiction, it is said, to Eliphaz's charge (15^4) that Job deflects men from religion, that *this* (^{8}), viz. the pitiable condition (^{7}) to which he is reduced, does indeed perplex other upright men; but that they, nevertheless, cling to the path of righteousness (^{9a}): they do not follow the godless, though the prosperity of the godless angers them (^{8b}), but, keeping them-

8 **Upright men are astonished at this,**
And the innocent is disturbed concerning the godless.
9 **Yet the righteous holdeth to his way,**
And he that hath clean hands increaseth strength.
10 **But return ye, all of ⌜you⌝, and come now:**
And I shall not find a wise man among you.
11 My days are past,
My purposes are broken off,
(Even) the desires of my heart.

---

selves pure, ultimately grow strong and prosperous themselves ([9b]). Let the friends, then, come on again with fresh arguments: not one of them in so doing will prove himself wise to Job ([10]). In [11] the description of Job's miserable condition in [7] is resumed. Obviously, then, it is possible to pass from [7] to [10] at once; whereas the intervening vv. can only be fitted in with difficulty; for who are these upright men to be astonished at Job's plight? Job's whole complaint is rather that his sufferings mark him out to all men as one smitten by God for his wickedness: then again, [8b] with its purely general reference follows awkwardly after [8a] with its special reference to Job. It is no more satisfactory to generalize the "this" of [8] completely, and to particularize the reference in [9] to Job, explaining the vv. to mean upright men are perplexed by "these moral wrongs which they see prevail in God's rule of the world" (Du.); yet Job, who is one of them, is resolved to cling to righteousness. Du. and Peake are probably right, therefore, in regarding the vv. (Peake [8, 9] at least) as out of place, and probably a part of the speech of one of the friends; Du. inserts [8-10] after 18[3]; the meaning then being that upright men, like the friends, are astounded at Job's profanity ("this" ([8a]) is then strictly parallel to "the godless" ([8b])), but hold firm to their righteous way of life ([9a]) and grow strong therein ([9b]). [10a] Du. alters to the sing. taking it closely with 18[4a]; [10b] he regards as an addition after the vv. had become misplaced.

8b. Me., transposing the terms, rendered: And the godless triumphs over the righteous; but even this does not accommodate the vv. satisfactorily to their present position.

9. *Yet*] Hebr. *and.*

[12] They change the night into day;
"The light" (say they) "is near unto the darkness."

---

11 in continuance of [7] describes Job's desperate condition. Cp. v.[1] 7^6 $9^{25f.}$. Bu., My days pass away to my death, Broken are the cords of my understanding: Du., My days pass away without hope, The desires of my heart are annihilated: see phil. n.

12. The v. has been taken to mean: while my condition is really desperate ([11. 13. 16]), my friends say: You are passing through dark days now, but a brighter time is soon coming; this would, indeed, be a correct account of the friends' "comfort" in the first series of speeches (see 5^{17-26} 8^{20-22} 11^{13-19}), and Ṣophar actually used the fig. of light and darkness: "Thy life will rise up more (brightly) than the noonday, though it be dark, it will become as the morning" (11^{17}). But Eliphaz in his second speech, to which Job is now replying, says nothing of the kind. That the friends are the subject of the vb. in [a], and authors of the statement in [b], is not at all clearly indicated: if [10] is in place, we should expect at least "Ye change": and if [7-10] are out of place (see above), the reference to the friends is still less natural. The v. would be more in place if it expressed Job's conviction that the light of his life is fading into the darkness of death; but no very satisfactory emendation has been proposed (see phil. n.).

13–16. Job, being already as good as dead, has no further ground for hope; for the hope of restoration to former happiness and prosperity does not descend to Sheol, of which Job already feels himself an inhabitant: "all hope abandon ye who enter here." The general sense remains the same whichever view of the construction of the v. be taken—that represented in the translation above (so RV. Di. Da. Bu. al.), or the older (𝔊𝔙, AV.) and in many respects the more striking view adopted by Del. Du. (cp. Peake) according to which [13f.] should be rendered: If I hope, Sheol is mine house; I have spread my couch in darkness; I have said to the pit, Thou art my father, To the worm, My mother and my sister. This does more justice to the identity of the root of the vb. in [13] (אקוה) and the noun in [15] (תקותי). In the former case the thought

13 If I look for Sheol as mine house;
If I have spread my couch in darkness;
14 If I have said to the pit, Thou art my father;
To the worm, My mother, and my sister!
15 Where then is my hope?
And as for my ⸢prosperity⸣, who can see it?
16 Will they go down ⸢with *me*⸣ into Sheol?
Or ⸢shall we descend⸣ together into the dust?

---

more precisely is: If Sheol is all I have to look for ($^{13f.}$), what real hope have I left (^{15})? In the latter: If I still hope, death, not life, faces me ($^{13f.}$), and the certainty of death extinguishes ($^{15f.}$) hope. If ^{12} refers to the comfort given by the friends, ^{15} doubtless replies to it: if all I have really to hope for is Sheol, what becomes of the false hopes with which you would buoy me up?

13b. Cp. Ps. 139^{8}.—*In darkness*] the darkness of Sheol: cp. 10^{21}.

14. For the form of expression, cp. Pr. 7^{4}: also c. 30^{29}.—*The pit*] EV. here and, following 𝔊, sometimes elsewhere, incorrectly connecting the noun שחת (from שוח, *to sink down*, as נחת from נוח, etc.) with √שחת, render *corruption*. The word, used of a hollow dug in the earth for catching prey (Ps. 7^{16} 9^{16} 94^{13}, Pr. 26^{27}, Ezk. 19^{4}), or a natural hollow (9^{31}), is applied to the underworld ($33^{18. 22. 24. 28. 30}$, Is. 38^{17} (51^{14}), Ezk. 28^{8}, Jon. 2^{7}, Ps. 16^{10} $30^{10\,(9)}$ $49^{10\,(9)}$ $55^{24\,(23)}$ 103^{4} †), conceived as a hollow within the earth; or, if as some suppose (*Lex.*), the term originally denoted a pit in Sheol, "the depths of Sheol" (Pr. 9^{18}), the part is here, as usually in OT., used for the whole.—*Thou art*] the words should probably be omitted: see phil. n.

15. Both lines, by rhetorical questions, imply that hope does not exist for Job: with the form of ^{a}, cp. 15^{23} 21^{28}, of ^{b} 7^{8}.—*Prosperity*] so 𝔊: 𝔐 *hope*, repeating ^{a}.

16. Cp. Ps. $49^{18\,(17)}$. The translation follows 𝔊: RV. is not a legitimate rendering of 𝔐, which should mean rather, if it meant anything, To the bars (?) of Sheol they (fem.) shall go down, if together on the dust (there is) rest (or, into the dust we descend): see phil. n.—*The dust*] of the grave: cp. 7^{21} 19^{25} 20^{11}.

XVIII. 1 Then answered Bildad the Shuḥite, and said,
2 How long wil⌜t thou⌝ lay snares for words?
Understand, and afterwards we will speak.
3 Wherefore are we accounted as beasts,
(And) are ⌜obtuse⌝ in ⌜thy⌝ sight?

XVIII. Bildad's second speech.—After impatiently asking whether Job will never stop (^{2}), why he looks upon his friends as blockheads (^{3}), and whether he expects the order of the world to be upset on his account (^{4}), Bildad confines himself in the remainder of his speech to painting a dark picture of the fate of the wicked, harassed and tormented while he lives ($^{5-13}$), and (leaving no posterity) doomed to oblivion when he dies ($^{14-21}$).

2. According to 𝔐, Bildad here and in ^{3}, though no longer in ^{4}, addresses himself not, as elsewhere, and here too according to 𝔊, to Job alone in the sing., but to Job and others associated with him—How long will *ye*, etc., Wherefore are we obtuse in *your* eyes? But it is improbable that the 2nd plurals are original (see phil. n.), and ^{2} perhaps originally read, "When at last wilt thou cease talking; Leave off (now), that *we* may begin to speak."—*How long*] as at the beginning of Bildad's first speech (8^{2}).—*Lay snares for words*] hunt and entrap words, setting before us far-fetched arguments which turn out to be irrelevant and after all nothing but words. In 8^{2} Bildad's figure suggests the very opposite of this: there Job's words pour forth like a great wind. AV. "how long (will it be ere) you make an end of words" is a questionable rendering of 𝔐, but may coincide with the meaning of the original text (see phil. n.).—*Understand*] not the friends as Job had asserted (17^{4}), but Job himself has been lacking in intelligence; let him now exchange his logic chopping for an intelligent treatment of the question, and the debate may continue; cp. 𝔙, Intelligite prius, et sic loquamar. *We* in this case includes Job, and it would be better to point the vb. as Nif. (cp. Mal. $3^{13.16}$), and render, we will speak to one another. But the reading of 𝔊 (see above) is preferable.

3. Cp. $17^{4\,(10)}$.—*Beasts*] *i.e.* unintelligent: cp. Ps. 73^{22}.—

4 . . . . . .
Thou that tearest thyself in thy anger,
Shall the earth on thy account be forsaken?
Or a rock be removed out of its place?
5 Yea, the light of the wicked is put out,
And the flame of his fire doth not shine.
6 The light is dark in his tent,
And his lamp above him is put out.

Obtuse] suits the parallel better than "unclean" (𝔐 EV.). Moreover, Job has not charged the friends with being unclean—not even in 17^{8} by implication. After ^{3} Du. inserts $17^{8f.}$: see on those vv.

4. Du. inserts 17^{10a} (corrected), thus obtaining a distich: But turn (cp. 6^{29}) and come now, Thou that tearest thyself in thy anger. It is not God, as Job has asserted (16^{9}), who tears Job, but Job himself in his rage against God (cp. 5^{2}). The two illustrations in $^{4b.\,c}$ drawn from the physical order are commonly supposed to point figuratively to the moral order of the world, and to mean, therefore, "Is the established order of the world (viz. that suffering is a consequence and proof of sin) to be interrupted, in order that *thou* mayest continue to be reputed righteous?" (Dr.).—*Forsaken*] of its inhabitants, and therefore depopulated (cp. Is. 6^{12}, Lv. 26^{43}), though it was God's intention that it should be populated (Gn. 1^{28}, Is. 45^{18}).—*Or a rock*, etc.] 14^{18}.

5 f. However Job may rage (^{4}), the fact remains that the wicked do not prosper, and that those who do not prosper are wicked.—^{5a} = Pr. 13^{9b} 24^{20b}; $^{5b.\,6a.\,b}$ are variations of the same statement: thus in proverbial and perfectly general terms Bildad denies that the wicked can or do prosper, at the same time suggesting plainly enough the particular application: Job is not prosperous, Job is wicked. The light, or lamp (^{6b}, cp. 1 K. 11^{36}), burning in the house, and the fire burning on the hearth, are symbols that the fortunes of the owner are still intact; when those fortunes are broken, the light goes out (21^{17}).—*His lamp above him*] suspended from the roof of the tent; it is unlikely that ^{b} introduces another figure than that

7 The steps of his strength are narrowed,
And his own counsel casteth him down.
8 For he is carried into a net by his own feet,
And he walketh upon the toils.
9 A trap taketh hold of ⌜his⌝ heel,
A snare layeth hold on him.
10 The noose for him is hid in the ground,
And the gin for him on the way.
11 Terrors affright him on every side,
And chase him at every step.

---

in [a] and refers to the lamp that lights up the way of one walking (29^{3}).

7. A fresh figure for the failing fortunes of the wicked: he no longer, as in the days of his *strength* (Gn. 49^{3}), walks confidently and freely, with plenty of room (Ps. $18^{37(36)}$, Pr. 4^{12}) to walk in, but slowly under the constraint of a narrow path, and that full of obstacles which cause him to stumble ([b]).—*Casteth him down*] or, rather (see phil. n.), *causeth him to stumble*: cp. Pr. 4^{12b}.

8–10. The piling up of the terms and figures for snares and traps indicates the strength of Bildad's conviction that there is no escape for the wicked from doom; by one means or another, as he treads his narrow way ([7]), he must be brought down.

8a. Or, rather perhaps (see phil. n.), For his foot is carried into the net: "his own" above and RV. represents an emphasis which does not exist in 𝔐.—*The toils*] another form of net (see phil. n.), or "lattice work" (cp. 2 K. 1^{2}) laid over and concealing a pit, to capture wild beasts, which, walking on unsuspectingly, fall into the pit.

9. *A trap*] that closes when trodden on, and catches: Is. 8^{14} (n.), Jer. 48^{44}, Ps. 124^{7}, and often.—*A snare*] see phil. n.

10. *Noose*] Pr. 5^{22}, and in the phrase "nooses (RV. "cords") of death," Ps. 18^{6} al.—*Gin*] see phil. n.

11. *Terrors*] בלהות, [14] 24^{17} 27^{20} 30^{15}; also Ps. 73^{19}, Ezk. 26^{21} 27^{36} 28^{19}: sing. Is. 17^{14} †. Wherever he goes the wicked man hears spectral noises (15^{21} Eliphaz), and sees spectral forms, which make his life a constant terror to him.

12 His strength ⌜is⌝ famished,
And calamity is ready for his halting.
13 ⌜Through disease⌝ his skin is consumed,
The firstborn of death consumeth his limbs.
14 He is plucked out of his tent wherein he trusteth;
And he is marched to the king of terrors.

---

12. *Famished*] undermined by hunger. The line agrees better with [11], and the parallel line if rendered, *Trouble hungereth for him*; but see phil. n.—*Calamity*] final ruin, 21[17], Ob. [13].—*Is ready*] 15[23].—*For his halting*] cp. Ps. 35[15] 38[18], Jer. 20[10]; if he halts, ruin sees to it that he never gets going again. Less vividly and less probably 𝔐 may be rendered "at his side."

13. Fatal disease attacks the wicked man. On the text, see phil. n.—*The firstborn of death*] like the Arabic *bint el-maniyya*, "daughter of fate," meaning fever, this phrase should mean fatal disease, possibly the worst and deadliest form of disease, though the parallel cited for this superlative sense of firstborn, "the firstborn of the poor," meaning the poorest of the poor (Is. 14[30]), is textually doubtful; as in Is. 14[30] so here a superlative is not altogether in place; not all the wicked die of elephantiasis, to which, with a covert allusion to Job (so Dr.), Bildad is here supposed to refer, and yet Bildad is describing the fate of the wicked in general; otherwise it is tempting to see in the line a reference to a specific symptom of elephantiasis, the falling off of pieces of the limbs. Unsuitable or less probable explanations are: the angel of death (𝔗), the worm of corruption (cp. 24[20]: Marshall), the terrors of death (Ley); or, one doomed to death (consumes his own limbs (cp. Is. 9[20]) in his ravenous hunger, Ew.).

14. The wicked man is torn away from his home in death.—**a.** 𝔙 avellatur de tabernaculo suo fiducia eius, whence AV. (cp. 𝔊), a possible, but in the context a less probable translation of 𝔐.—*The king of terrors*] Death personified as a king with spectral terrors as his subjects and ministers; a different personification occurs in Ps. 49[15] where Death is the shepherd of the wicked gathered like a flock to Sheol: cp. also Is. 28[15]

15 In his tent there dwelleth that which is naught of his;
Brimstone is scattered upon his habitation.
16 His roots are dried up beneath,
And above his branch is cut off.
17 His remembrance perisheth from the earth,
And he hath no name on the face of the open plain.

(Death (|| Sheol) a party to a treaty). Curiously the ancient versions, with the exception of 𝕿, do not recognize in the phrase "the king of terrors" (see phil. n.).

15. After his death, the wicked man's house lies uninhabited and accursed.—*That which is naught of his*] weeds (Hos. 9^6, Zeph. 2^9) and wild animals (Is. $13^{21f.}$ 34^{11}), such as are found in desolate places, are probably intended, if the text is correct. In [b] the desolation of his homestead is differently expressed; as a mark of the curse of God, brimstone falls on it and makes it uninhabitable: cp. Gn. 19^{24}, Dt. 29^{22}, Ps. 11^6. 𝕿 for [a] has: His wife (𝕳: she) shall dwell in a tent not his. According to Ehrlich the v. means that "it," viz. the infection of leprosy, continues in the house after it has ceased to be the leper's, and the house is disinfected with sulphur.

16. The wicked man leaves no posterity; his whole family perishes with him, and consequently ([17]) he not only dies, but is forgotten. For the figure, cp. Am. 2^9; in [19] the same statement is made literally. Bu. omits [16]: 𝕲 [15b. 16] ([15a] = [19c] 𝕲); but the author of Job is fond of referring to, or drawing figures or using metaphors derived from, plant-life: see $8^{16ff.}$ 14^7 $15^{30ff.}$ 19^{10}.—*Is cut off*] rather than *droops, withers* (see phil. n. on 14^2): since [b] scarcely states the sequence to [a], there is no force in Di.'s argument that withering and not cutting off is the result of drying up the roots: the purpose of the figure is rather to depict the immediate and simultaneous destruction of branch and root: both perish at once, and from the dried up roots no *fresh* branches (ct. 14^9) will ever grow.

17. He is forgotten in the cultivated country (cp. Ps. 49^{12}) in which his own homestead and fields lay, and over the wide stretch of the steppe country beyond into which he sent his cattle to graze (see phil. n.).

18 He is thrust forth from light into darkness,
And chased out of the world.
19 He hath neither offspring nor family among his people,
Nor any survivor in the place where he sojourned.
20 At his day they of the east are appalled,
And they of the west lay hold on horror.
21 Surely such are the dwellings of the unrighteous,
And this is the place of him that knoweth not God.

18, 19. V.^{18} repeats the idea of ^{14}, ^{19} of ^{16}.—*From light into darkness*] from the light (3^{16}) of life (33^{30}, Ps. 56^{14}: cp. c. 3^{20} "light" ‖ to "life") into the darkness of Sheol (as $10^{21f.}$ 17^{13}).

19. *Nor any survivor*] from God's judgment on his house and family.—*The place* (or, rather, *the places*) *where he sojourned*] enjoyed guest-right: the phrase (במגוריו) is expressive: ^{15} has already stated that no one of his will remain in his house after him; this v. goes further; no one will escape the judgment and be found casting himself on the hospitality of others (cp. the parallel "among his people").

20. The whole world is horrified at the wicked man's fate. —*At his day*] the day of his death and of God's punishment of him: cp. 1 S. 26^{10}, Ps. 37^{13}, Jer. 50^{27}. 𝔊 *At him* (עלימו as 20^{23} 27^{23}, for על יומו) is inferior.—*They of the east . . . they of the west*] or, *the later ones . . . the former ones* (see phil. n.); *i.e.* the wicked man's contemporaries on earth, and, as the news reaches them in Sheol, those who have predeceased him; so terrible is the death of the wicked that the very shades in Sheol are horrified at it.—*Lay hold on horror*] for the idiom, cp. 21^{6}, Is. 13^{8}: it is quite unnecessary to forsake 𝔐 for 𝔊, *on them of the west horror lays hold.*

21. The v. clinches the argument implicit in the previous description of the wicked: such a fate and none other awaits the wicked: cp. the conclusion to Ṣophar's speech, 20^{29}; ct. the conclusion to Eliphaz's first speech, which summarizes the preceding description of the man who fears God, and 8^{19} where Bildad summarizes, as here, his description of the wicked, but then 8^{20-22} closes on a happier and more hopeful note; Ṣophar

XIX. 1 Then Job answered and said,
2 How long will ye vex my soul,
And break me in pieces with words?
3 These ten times ye put me to confusion;
Ye are not ashamed that ye deal wrongfully against me.

---

alone in the first round of speeches closes on a sinister note, 11^{20}; all alike so close their second speeches.

XIX. Job's reply to Bildad's second speech.—How long are the friends to go on wronging Job by false accusations ($^{2f.}$); Job's calamities are due not to just punishment for sin, but to God's unjust and violent treatment of him ($^{4-7}$); God's hostility ($^{8-12}$) has led to the alienation of Job's family and acquaintances ($^{13-19}$) and left him with nothing but bare existence (^{20})? Cannot his friends pity him? Why do they instead increasingly persecute him ($^{21f.}$)? If only his assertion of innocence might be perpetuated (after his now imminent death) ($^{23f.}$)! It will be; and, moreover, God will vindicate him and show Himself to be on his side ($^{25-27}$); and so the friends will contiuue their persecution of him at their peril ($^{28f.}$)!

2–6. How long are the friends to go on aggravating Job's sufferings by what they say? They have repeatedly and shamelessly wronged him (^{3}) by suggesting that the cause of his great and extraordinary sufferings lies in his sin; but it does not; on the contrary, the cause of his suffering is that God has turned the scales of justice against him (^{6}), so that there has wrongly fallen to him the penalty of great crimes which he had never committed; and thereby God has given a ground, according to the current theory, for an argument against his innocence.

2. *How long*] beginning like Bildad, 18^{2}.—*Vex my soul*] by your severe and uncompassionate treatment of me; for the vb., cp. especially Is. 51^{23}, "I (Yahweh) will put it (the cup of my fury) into the hand of those that *vexed* thee, that said to thy soul, Bow down that we may pass over"; La. $1^{5.12}$ of the pain caused to Sion by Yahweh's severe punishment of her; 3^{32} (antithetical to "show compassion"). Not only do his "comforters" not alleviate ($16^{4f.}$), they positively add to his sufferings (cp. 16^{2}).

4 And be it indeed that I have erred,
Mine error remaineth with myself.

---

3. *These ten times*] *i.e.* these many times: how often! cp. Nu. 14^{22}; also for ten = many, Gn. 31^{7}, Lv. 26^{26}.

4. The exact force of the v. is far from clear. In the first place, does it virtually admit error or (cp. No. 4 below) deny it? Certainly an admission of such error as would deserve what Job now suffers is out of the question. But error is a mild word; cp. "Errors, who can discern" (Ps. 19^{13}); the possibility of errors, unknown to himself, weighs upon the conscience of the religiously sensitive man, but these do not account, like great transgressions, for great sufferings. If, then, the v. admits such error (and even sin Job admits elsewhere, 10^{6} n. 13^{26}), it is best taken as meaning: granted that I have sinned, the penalty of that sin no doubt comes home to me, but it affords no ground for you (^{5}) to argue from the reproach which my great sufferings cast upon me that I have *greatly* sinned. Richter (אם נער for אמנם) gives a special turn to the kind of error admitted: If in my youth I erred (cp. 13^{26}, Ps. 25^{7}), Is my error (for ever) to abide with me? But the vb. (לון) refers to a recurrent and temporary, rather than to a permanent stay. Other interpretations are: (1) Granted I have erred, my error is my affair, not yours; but this is only possible, and even then unsatisfactory, if the *admission* of *error* is tantamount to the *denial* of great *sin*; for if Job has greatly sinned, that is altogether an affair of the friends, being the complete justification of their case against him: moreover, in 6^{24} Job appealed to the friends to make plain to him what his error was: (2) Granted I have erred, I alone am cognizant (את as 12^{3} 14^{5}: cp. עם, 9^{35} n.) of my errors, *i.e.* my sin is venial, not gross and open, and you, having no real knowledge of it, are charging me with sin without justification (Di.); but, as Hi. pointed out, one of the charges of the friends against Job is precisely what on this hypothesis he admits, viz. that he keeps his sin to himself, making no confession of it; (3) my sin hurts only myself, not you—a parallel to 7^{20} (Job's sin does not injure God): so Peake; (4), Du.: "Have I indeed erred? With me

5 If indeed ye magnify yourselves against me,
And argue against me my reproach;
6 Know then that God hath subverted me (in my cause),
And hath compassed me about with his net.
7 Behold, I cry out, Violence! but I am not answered:
I cry for help, but there is no judgment.

---

doth error (so 𝔊) tarry?" the question (expressed by the emotional ואף instead of the interrogative particle) of course expecting the answer no. This would be the best explanation if, where the interrogation is so important, the particle could be omitted (G–K. 150*a*).

5 f. An alternative translation of ^{5} is: Will ye indeed magnify yourselves . . . and argue . . . ? cp. *Lex. s.v.* אם, 50*b*. On the other hand, the translation, If indeed ye will magnify yourselves against me, then argue (or prove), etc., can scarcely be defended, the impf. with *waw* in the apodosis being abnormal (Dr. § 136). Translated as above, the imperative (דעו) without waw may be paralleled by 1 S. 20^{21} 21^{10} (Dr. $136\beta^{*}$).

6. God has done what Bildad (8^{3}) and Elihu (34^{12}) think impossible: He has perverted justice: Job is ensnared like an innocent beast by a mighty, ruthless hunter.—*Net*] see phil. n.: the word is different from any of those used in 18^{8-10}.

7–20. Description of God's severe dealings with Job, both ($^{7-12}$, a series of figures) generally, and ($^{13-20}$) in particular by estranging those to whom he might most naturally have turned for comfort and support, so leaving Job abandoned of men and alone.

7. Not Job (16^{17}), but God is the doer of violence, and Job is His victim; he calls out, to attract the notice of passers-by (Dt. 22^{24}), Violence! (cp. Jer. 20^{8}, Hab. 1^{2}), but none of them respond or give him assistance to secure justice against his assailant.—*I am not answered*] by any man: this is the necessary implication of the pass. in Pr. 21^{13}; if the meaning is I am not answered by God (cp. 30^{20}, Hab. 1^{2}), then there is the same double thought of God which has appeared before ($16^{19.21}$ 17^{3} n.): Against God assailing me I cry out to God passing by—but receive no help.

8 My path he hath fenced up that I cannot pass,
And upon my paths he setteth darkness.
9 My glory he hath stripped from off me,
And he hath taken away the crown on my head.
10 He breaketh me down on every side, and I am gone;
And he hath plucked up mine hope like a tree.
11 He hath also kindled his wrath against me,
And he counteth me unto him as (one of) his adversaries.
12 One and all his troops come on,
And cast up their way against me,
And encamp round about my tent.
13 My brethren he hath put far from me,
And mine acquaintance are wholly estranged from me.
14 My kinsfolk have failed,
And my familiar friends have forgotten me.

---

8. Fresh figures: God prevents Job pursuing his way by setting barriers across it and involving it in darkness: cp. La. 3^{9}, and see on 3^{23}.

9. God has stripped Job bare of the reputation for righteousness which he once enjoyed (29^{14}); bereft of his possessions he is in the estimate of the world a sinner.

10. *Breaketh me down*] The fig. in [a] is of a building: Job's life is in ruins: nor is there any chance of restoration: [b] any hope he might have had is like a tree not merely cut down and still capable of shooting up again (14^{7}), but uprooted.

11b. = 13^{24}.

12. God's troops lay siege to Job: military figures are also used in 10^{17} 16^{14} 30^{12}.—*Cast up their way*] *i.e.* create siege works from which to attack the invested fortress.—*My tent*] absent from 𝔊, in which [12] is a distich.

13. *He hath put far*] 𝔊 *have gone far*, in agreement with the following lines ([13b-19]), where the vbs. indicate directly the action of Job's friends in avoiding him: so Di.—*Mine acquaintance*] cp. 42^{11}; but a very slight change (ידעו for ידעי) gives *they have known it* (*and*): so Me. Bi.[1] Bu., thus securing a whole distich for the "brethren," and avoiding the close juxtaposition of ידעי [13b] and מידעי [14b].

15 They that sojourn in my house, and my maids, count me for a stranger:
I am become an alien in their sight.
16 I call unto my servant, and he giveth me no answer;
With my mouth must I entreat him.
17 My breath is strange to my wife,
And I am loathsome to the children of my (mother's) womb.

---

14 f. The division of the lines in 𝔐 is probably faulty (see phil. n.): an alternative division allows the rendering,

My kinsmen and my familiar friends have failed,
They that sojourn in my house have forgotten me;
And my maids count me for a stranger,
I am become an alien in their sight.

But not improbably the fourth of these lines has suffered transposition and originally was the parallel to the first.

Kinsfolk] Heb. *those that are near*, used of those nearly related: cp. Lv. $21^{2f.}$, where the range of the term is exemplified; cp. also Lv. 25^{25}, Nu. 27^{11}, and, in a similar context to the present, Ps. $38^{12\,(11)}$, "those that are near (of kin) to me stand afar off."—*Failed*] lit. *ceased* (cp. 14^{7}), *i.e.* to treat me as a kinsman or the like. Du. for *have failed and my familiar friends* reads *have ceased to know me*: but see phil. n.—*Familiar friends*] מידעי as Ps. $31^{12\,(11)}$ $88^{9\,(8)}$ $55^{14\,(12)}$, 2 K. 10^{11}.

15. *They that sojourn*] those who had sought the protection of Job's house and enjoyed his hospitality—the *ger* (EV. "stranger") of Ex. 20^{10}.—*Maids*] female slaves.—*A stranger*] or *alien*, properly one who belongs to another family, class, or community (cp. Nu. 1^{57} n.): the tables are now so completely turned that the very persons who owed their places in the household to Job now look upon him as one outside the family.—*Alien*] or *foreigner*.

16. Job's slave, instead of waiting for and immediately responding to the least gesture indicative of his wish (Ps. 123^{2}), does not even obey an express command; and at best now he only responds to humble entreaty and appeal for compassion.

17. The loathsome features of his disease (2^{7} n.) repel Job's nearest and dearest relations—his wife, and those who had

18 Even young children despise me;
I would arise, and they speak against me!
19 All the men of my circle abhor me;
And they whom I loved are turned against me.
20 My bone cleaveth to my skin$_\wedge$,
And I am escaped ⌜with my flesh in my teeth.⌝

---

issued from the same womb as himself.—*The children of my (mother's) womb*] *i.e.* my uterine brothers (and sisters), a far narrower term than the "brethren" of [13]: cp. the limiting clause attached to "brother(s)" in Gn. 43[29], Jg. 8[19], "My brethren, the sons of my mother." "My womb," meaning "my mother's womb," has already occurred in 3[10]. If it were necessary to explain the phrase of *children* (cp. Mic. 6[7], Ps. 132[11]) of Job, the passage would probably be in conflict with the Prologue (and also 8[4] 29[5]: see n.), according to which all Job's children had perished; for the alternative suggestions are unsatisfactory, viz. that the children intended are children of concubines (𝔊 Ew.), or grandchildren (Hrz.). W. R. Smith (*Kinship and Marriage in Early Arabia*, p. 34) explained the phrase as meaning *clansmen* (*beṭen*, as in Arabia, meaning *clan*); but this would make [17b] more nearly a repetition of [13a].

18. The young children about his house (see phil. n.), though not, of course, his own children, mock at (cp. 2 K. 2[23]) his diseased appearance, or [b] the difficulty with which alone he can rise from the ground.

19. *The men of my circle*] or confidence (סוד: 15[8] phil. n.); the men to whom he had been wont to communicate his secrets, or intimate thoughts (cp. Ps. 55[15 (14)]).

20. Job is already little better than a skeleton, and his hold on life precarious. With [a] cp. Ps. 102[6b], La. 4[8].—*To my skin*] 𝔐 + *and to my flesh*; but see phil. n.—*With my flesh in my teeth*] cp. 13[14]. 𝔐 *with the skin of my teeth*: the words have passed into a proverb for nothing, or next to nothing; but, as they are probably the result of an accidental corruption of the text, it is not surprising that the origin and exact meaning of "skin of the teeth" has remained obscure; various theories

21 Have pity upon me, have pity upon me, O ye my friends;
For the hand of God hath touched me.
22 Why do ye persecute me as God,
And are not satisfied with my flesh?

---

are cited and discussed by Di. and Del. Other emendations of the v. are discussed in the phil. n.

21 f. Ruthlessly assailed by God and abandoned by other men, even those nearest him, Job, yearning for some support, appeals to the compassion of the three friends who, unlike others, were at least physically still near him: for the moment all thought of argument is abandoned; he no longer seeks to convince them, or asks them to be just to him; he asks them to be *kind*; he makes his appeal on the two grounds that they were old friends of his and that he is sorely smitten; but the second ground of his appeal is the very reason why the friends cannot be kind in the only sense that will satisfy Job; he wishes them not to continue to hold him guilty of sin, and they, because he is smitten by God, are convinced that he is. The appeal of ^{21}, so unlike Job's other addresses to the friends, is abandoned: the friends give no sign of relenting; and in ^{22}, after his usual manner, Job asks them the cause and meaning of their cruel treatment.—*Have pity upon me*] or, *be kind, gracious to me*: cp. the use of the vb. in Dt. 7^{2} 28^{50}, Ps. 37^{21}. —*Touched*] as 1^{11} (see n. there) 2^{5}.

22. Why, relentless and persistent as God, do they never come to an end of calumniating him by arguing that he has committed great sins?—*Are not satisfied with my flesh*] here the meaning (ct. 31^{31}) rests on the use of the phrase "to eat the flesh, or fragments, of a man," in the sense of to calumniate or accuse him; cp. in Aram. Dn. 3^{8} $6^{25\,(24)}$ "to eat the fragments of" (EV. "accuse"); and "the eater of fragments" is the rendering of ὁ διάβολος in the Peshitta of the NT.; and in the Qor. (49^{12}) Mohammed plays on the two meanings of the phrase, the literal and the metaphorical: "Let not one of you traduce another in his absence. Would any of you like to eat the flesh of his brother being dead? Surely ye would loathe it." See further, Schult. on this passage, Ges. *Thes.* 91*a*.—*Are not*

23 Oh would, then, that my words were written!
Oh would that they were inscribed in a book!
24 That with an iron pen and lead
They were for ever graven in the rock.

---

satisfied with] never come to an end of, never have enough of; cp. Pr. $30^{15f.}$.

23 f. When Job dies, the insatiable hunger of the friends for calumniating him (^{22b}) will continue; and, their accusations being unchallenged, he will pass down to posterity as a great sinner. His first reaction (a second follows in ^{25}) against this thought is a wish: this wish is expressed in ^{23a}, and reinforced with details so arranged as to reach a climax in $^{23b.\,24}$: would that my words were written (^{23a}), for an abiding testimony, in a book (^{23b}), or even more enduringly and conspicuously in (lead or) rock (^{24}): in that case, to the end of time, the charges brought against his name will, at least, never pass unchallenged; and he, even after death, will continue to defend his integrity.

23. *My words*] not the words that follow in $^{25ff.}$ (Hi.) (an inscription (^{24}) would start strangely with the conj. (ואני) at the beginning of ^{25}), nor the exact words of Job's previous speeches in their full extent, but the substance of those speeches, in so far as they maintained his integrity against the accusations (^{22b}) of the friends.—*Inscribed*] Is. 30^{8}.—*In a book*] or *scroll* (31^{35} n.), where they would continue as an enduring testimony: cp. Is. 30^{8}. The term "book" does not necessarily imply extensive contents: it is used, *e.g.*, of a deed of purchase (Jer. 32^{11}), or divorce (Dt. 24^{1}), or of a letter (2 S. 11^{14}). Du., *in his* (*i.e.* God's) *book*, on the ground that Job would not express a *wish* which he could himself most easily satisfy; the suggestion is well criticized by Peake: see also phil. n.

24. It is uncertain whether this v. referred to inscriptions on one, or on two (cp. 𝔖𝔙) different materials, though 𝔐 is most naturally taken as referring to but one, and this also seems most effective; in this case the v. has been understood (since Rashi) to refer to engraving with an iron stylus (cp. Jer. 17^{1}) in the rock, and then, for greater clearness and lastingness, filling in the letters with lead. If two materials are referred to, it

25 But I know that my vindicator liveth,
And that hereafter he will stand up upon the dust.

---

is best, adopting two slight emendations (see phil. n.), to render, That with an iron stylus on lead, Or for ever in the rock they were graven. The climax is then reached in three stages: let my assertions of innocence be perpetuated *in a* written *scroll*, or, in what is more enduring, on *lead*(en tablets), or, in what is more enduring still, immovable also, and so free from risk of being lost, and conspicuous too—*in the rock*. Is the poet thinking of inscriptions cut in the rocks over tombs? Inscribed leaden tablets were much used in antiquity (Paus. ix. 31[4]; Pliny, *H.N.* 13. 669), especially for imprecations (cp. Tac. *Ann.* ii. 69, "nomen Germanici plumbeis tabulis insculptum"), and many such tablets have been discovered, including one containing a Phœnician inscription from Carthage of about the 3rd or 2nd cent. B.C.; see Wünsch, *Defixionum tabellæ Atticæ* (cp. Bliss, Macalister, and Wünsch, *Excavations in Palestine*, pp. 185–187; Cooke, *NSI*, No. 50, and the literature there cited).

25. But to the first ([23f.]) there now succeeds a second reaction to the thought ([22]) that his character after death will be undefended against the accusations which will still continue. This second reaction takes the form not, like the first, of a wish, but of a conviction under great emotional excitement (cp. [27]). For the moment, at least, Job is convinced that there is to be some better defence of his character than his own assertions recorded in writing for ever; not the indelible letters of a dead man, but a living person will defend and vindicate his character: none other than the living God Himself will at last free his name from reproach. In another remarkable respect the second appears to pass beyond the first thought, though corruption and obscurity of the text leave this point more ambiguous than could have been desired. In [23f.] Job is, relatively, satisfied to die, if he can be sure that as in life, so after death the accusations against him will not pass unchallenged; the written record made before his death will endure afterwards—a perpetual challenge. After death, as in life, Job will thus maintain

his own integrity. But the second thought is that his integrity will be maintained not merely by himself, but established by another, and that other God: in other words, a great change will occur after death: and of this change Job, even in death, will become conscious (vv.$^{26.\,27a}$); in life, right up to death, God has seemed to himself as to his friends against him; but when He vindicates Job, He will thereby range Himself on Job's side; and this change Job will see: his eyes will behold God on his side at last. Even if, as on the whole (in spite of $14^{14ff.}$) seems best, we thus interpret, there is still no belief here in a *continued* life of blessedness after death in which compensation in kind will be made for the inequalities of this life; the movement in the direction of a belief in a future which is here found is rather in response to the conviction that communion with God is real; in a moment after death it will be given to Job to know that he was not deluded in maintaining his integrity, and that he had not really forfeited the confidence of God. An alternative theory of these verses (Bu. Kautzsch) makes Job expect the vision of God (^{26}) this side of death; and, so far as the difficult and in part corrupt lines ($^{25b.\,26a.\,b}$) are concerned, there would be much to be said for interpreting the obscurities and ambiguities of the text towards this less startling conclusion; but the theory does not appear to give due weight to the fact that in $^{23f.}$ (as also in $16^{18f.}$) Job clearly expects to die *before* his character is cleared, and that no transition to the contrary thought, that he will only die *after* that has taken place, is to be discovered in ^{25}; on the other hand, the stress laid on the fact that the *vindicator* lives can be most naturally, if not only, explained as due to the implicit antithesis that Job will die. The other thought would naturally have been expressed in some such form as: I know that I shall live, and that I shall yet see God upon the earth (cp. Ps. $42^{6\,(5)}$, Is. 38^{11}) and on my side; and if this actually was the thought of the writer, it would be best to regard the word "liveth" as an intrusion into the text: but for this there is no sufficient reason (see phil. n.) Bruston (*Revue de théologie et des questions religeuses*, 1900, 244; *ZATW*, 1906, 143–146) understands Job to be describing a present vision of God vindicating him in the

future, when he is dead and no longer conscious. The obscure renderings of 𝔊 (understood by Clement of Rome (*Cor.* 26) and Origen (on Mt. 17^{29}: *P.G.* xiii. 1566) of the resurrection, but otherwise by most scholars of the Eastern Church from Chrysostom downwards) 𝔖𝔗 do not justify the conclusion that the translators detected a reference to experience after death: on the other hand, 𝔙 (hence AV.), with all clearness, does so and even introduces the idea of the resurrection *of the body* (cp. Aug. *De Civ. Dei*, xxii. 29). On the history of the interpretation of the passage, see Speer, *Zur Exegese von Hiob 19^{25-27}*, in *ZATW*, 1905, pp. 47–140 (with references to earlier discussions, p. 49).—*My vindicator*] The one who will vindicate me, establish my character; cp. "My witness," "He that voucheth for me," 16^{19}. The Hebrew term *goel* (cp. 3^{5} n.) may, by itself, without the addition of הדם, denote "the avenger of blood," and has sometimes been understood in this special sense here (cp. $16^{18ff.}$); but the thought of murder is not suggested here, and the *goel* had many other functions besides that of securing an equivalent for blood slain; he had to vindicate various claims and rights (cp. *e.g.* Lv. 25^{25}). With the present usage, cp. especially Pr. 23^{11}: Do not oppress widows and orphans, "for their vindicator (*i.e.* God) is mighty, He will plead their cause against thee": also Ps. 119^{154}.—*Liveth*] *i.e.* implicitly, for ever (cp. the phrase "the living God"): not something written for ever (^{24}), but a person who lives for ever will for ever vindicate Job.—*Hereafter*] lit. *as one* (*coming*) *after* (or, *at the last*); see phil. n. The particular nuance given to the phrase differs according to the view taken of the passage as a whole; by itself it might equally well mean *as one coming after* (I am dead); cp. Ec. 4^{16}; or, *as one who comes last* and says the last word—and that in Job's favour—in the dispute (Bu.). The line would read more easily if, instead of this phrase, there was a parallel to "my vindicator," such as "my afterman" (but see phil. n.).—*Stand up*] or *rise up*, as witness (cp. *e.g.* Dt. $19^{15f.}$, Ps. 27^{12}), or judge (31^{14}, Ps. 76^{10} 94^{16}, Is. 2^{19} of God). On other interpretations and emendations, see phil. n.—*Upon the dust*] perhaps, of Job's grave; cp. 7^{21} 17^{16} 20^{11} $21^{26?}$ (also, more remotely, 10^{9} 34^{15}, Ps. 104^{29}); though it is true, as Bu.

26 And . . . . .
    And away from my flesh I shall behold God.
27 Whom *I* shall behold (to be) on my side,
    And mine eyes shall see (to be) unestranged.
    My reins fail with longing within me.

---

urges, that in these passages, as in others (Ps. 7^{6} $22^{16.30}$, Is. 26^{19}, Dn. 12^{2}), the reference to the grave is much more clearly indicated than here. The alternative is to give the phrase the meaning "upon the earth": cp. especially $41^{25\,(33)}$, also 5^{6} (‖ "ground") 14^{8} 39^{14} (‖ "earth"): cp. also 8^{19} 22^{24} 27^{16} 28^{2} 30^{6} 40^{13}. If the implication is "upon the earth," there is a tacit advance on 16^{19}: there Job thinks of God his witness as in heaven; ultimately in the judgment of God he is innocent; here he is convinced that God will manifest his innocence to those on earth who have levelled accusations against him; for another tacit antithesis between "dust" and "heaven," see 4^{19} (after ^{18}). We. (see phil. n.) renders *against dust*, *i.e.* Job's friends and accusers; Bruston (*ZATW*, 1906, 144), *on behalf of dust*, *i.e.* of Job, who is soon to become dust; but though man may be said to be dust (Gn. 3^{19}, Ps. 103^{14}), that particular individuals should be *referred to* simply as dust is unlikely.

26. Line ^{a} is altogether obscure and uncertain: see phil. nn. Unfortunately ^{a} being obscure, the phrase in ^{b} rendered above, *away from my flesh*, *i.e.* after death, is ambiguous; in itself it may equally well mean *from my flesh*, *i.e.* in life: on the reasons derived from the wider context in favour of the former, see on ^{25}.—*I shall behold God*] cp. Ps. 11^{7} "the upright behold God," Ps. 17^{15}; Job thus, even in this phrase, implies his conviction that he will see God recognizing his integrity, and reconciled to him; but this thought is developed and more explicitly stated in the next distich.

27. In the vision Job will see that God is no longer, like men ($^{13.15}$), and as He Himself now seems, estranged, but ranged on his side.—*I*] emphatic—I, "of whom this might be deemed incredible" (Dr. Di.).—*On my side*] לְ, as in Gn. 31^{42}, Ps. $56^{10\,(9)}$ 118^{6}.—*Mine eyes shall see*] 42^{5}.—(*To be*) *unestranged*]

28 If ye say, "How will we persecute him!
Seeing that the root of the matter is found in ⌜him⌝";

---

or (to be) not a stranger (^{15} n.). The grammatically possible alternative rendering of the line, *And mine eyes and not* (*those of*) *a stranger, shall see,* is far less probable; no doubt Job alone might see God while others present at the time only *hear* Job's vindication or see some accompaniment of the vision (cp. 2 K. 2; Du.; add Acts 9^{7}); but Job is not at this moment interested in what will not happen to some one else, but in what will happen to himself, and in particular the aspect under which he will see God—God once more his friend. Moreover, what Job longs for is not the mere outward sight of a material manifestation, but direct inward vision or experience of God's attitude towards him: cp. n. on 42^{5}.

27c. The thought of the vision fills Job with deep emotion, and longing to see it realized.—*Reins*] in Hebrew psychology the seat of intense feeling: cp. Ps. 16^{7}, Pr. 23^{16}.—*Fail with longing*] the vb. *to fail* (כלה) with the same meaning as in Ps. $84^{3(2)}$ 119^{81} (predicated of the soul), $69^{4(3)}$ $119^{82c.\ 123}$.—*Within me*] not the usual phrase (בקרבי), but lit. *in my bosom*: cp., perhaps, Ec. 7^{9} and c. 23^{12} (emended). King (*J.Th.S.* xv. 76ff.) to avoid "my reins . . . in my bosom" would render the line, "I am fully determined in my bosom," or "I fully trust in my bosom" (cp. 𝔙); but this is hazardous. Possibly, however, the line, an isolated stichos, is corrupt.

28 f. A closing warning for the friends: if they persist in persecuting (^{28a}: cp. ^{22}) him on the ground that the sufferings of Job, the root of the matter at issue (דבר, as Ex. 18^{16}) and under discussion, are due to sin in Job, let them beware lest they themselves become the victims of the sword (Dt. 32^{41}) of divine justice.—b. *Him*] 𝔐 *me*: see phil. n. Adopting this emendation we might alternatively render the line, *And find the root of the matter in him*; but the order of the words does not favour this; and if the point were that the friends will push their scrutiny into Job's case till they detect the hidden mischief that lurks within him (Peake), a stronger vb. than "find," such as "search out," would be used.

29 Be ye afraid of the sword:
For ⌜such things⌝ are iniquities meet for the sword,
That ye may know there *is* a judge.

XX. 1 Then answered Ṣophar the Na'amathite, and said,
2 Therefore my thoughts ⌜disturb⌝ me,
And by reason of ⌜this⌝ my haste is within me.
3 The correction which putteth me to confusion must I hear,
But out of my understanding a spirit answereth me.

---

29. Lines $^{b.\ c.}$ are more or less corrupt; for alternative emendations, see phil. n.—*Such things*] 𝔐 *wrath.*—*A judge*] 𝔊 *judgment.*

XX. Ṣophar's second speech.—Provoked by Job's foolish words ($^{2f.}$), Ṣophar asks, though exceptionally (see 4^{2} n.) the speech does not *begin* with the question, whether Job is unaware (implying by the question that, of course, Job cannot be unaware) of the fact, old as history (^{4}), that the wicked, if they are exalted for a brief space ($^{5f.}$), perish ignobly (^{7}), and utterly vanish ($^{8f.}$), and their children are reduced to want ($^{9f.}$). All in their life that promised well is turned to bitterness ($^{11-18}$); they are forced to disgorge their unjustly and cruelly gained wealth ($^{19-22}$); for God punishes them (^{23}), and if they escape one disaster, it is but to succumb to another ($^{24-26}$). Heaven and earth turn witness against them (^{27}), and they lose all (^{28}): such is the fate of the wicked (^{29}).

2. *Disturb*] 𝔐 *answer*: see phil. n.—**b.** 𝔐 *and by reason of my haste within me*; see phil. n.—*Haste*] or, perhaps, *emotion.* The rebukes administered and advice offered by Job (*e.g.* $19^{2f.\ 23f.}$), which are an affront (^{3a}) to Ṣophar, call forth the present impetuous or passionate reply.

3. *The correction which*, etc.] מוסר כלמתי: cp. (מ׳ שלומנו, "the correction which led to our peace," Is. 53^{5}).—*Which putteth me to confusion*] a retort to Job's complaint, 19^{3}.—**b.** A bad parallel to ^{a}, and scarely intelligible: but see phil n. Slightly emended, the line gives excellent parallelism and sense: And with wind void of understanding thou answerest me: cp. 8^{2} (Bildad), 15^{2} (Eliphaz).

4 Dost thou know this (as being) from of old,
Since man was placed upon the earth,
5 That the triumphing of the wicked is short,
And the joy of the godless but for a moment?
6 Though his loftiness mount up to the heavens,
And his head reach unto the clouds;
7 Like his (own) dung he perisheth for ever:
They who have seen him say, Where is he?
8 He flieth away as a dream, and is not found;
And he is chased away as a vision of the night.
9 The eye which saw him seeth him no more;
Neither doth his place any more behold him.
10 His children court the favour of the poor,
And his hands give back his wealth.

4b. Cp. Dt. 4^{32}.

5. *The triumphing*] *i.e.* the exultant joyous shout (רננה, as 3^{7}, Ps. 100^{2} 63^{6}).

6. Cp. Is. 14^{13}.

7a. *Like his own dung*] completely (cp. [b] 1 K. 14^{10}, 2 K. 9^{37}) and shamefully. But the unnecessary suffix, though not the coarseness of the figure (for cp. [15], though scarcely 11^{12}, which Di. also quotes), may throw doubt on the correctness of the text or translation. 𝔖 *like a whirlwind*; Ew. *like his majesty* (Ar. *jalâl*); Che. (*ET.* x. 382) like *his glory* (כבודו); King (*J.Th.S.* xv. 39), *while he is confiding* (כגללו, a vb.: cp. Ps. $22^{9\,(8)}$ 37^{5}, Pr. 16^{3}; but these passages do not justify giving to גלל (lit. *to roll*) used absolutely the sense *to confide*).—*Where is he*] cp. 14^{10}.

8. For the figures, cp. Is. 29^{7}, Ps. 73^{20}.

9. Line [a] closely resembles 7^{8a} (Job), Ps. 103^{16b}, [b] 7^{10b}. Cp. also 8^{18} (Bildad).

10a. Or, The poor oppress his children; or, His children are crushed into poor ones: see phil. n. In any case, the meaning is that his children are, or suffer as, the poorest of the poor (cp. 5^{4} Eliphaz). Coming after [9] it would be easy to understand [10a] of the impoverishment of the children after the wicked man's death; but in that case [b] also should refer to

11 His bones are full of his youth,
But it will lie down with him in the dust.
12 Though wickedness be sweet in his mouth,
Though he hide it under his tongue;
13 Though he spare it, and do not let it go,
But keep it still within his palate;
14 (Yet) his food in his bowels is turned;
The gall of cobras is within him.
15 He swalloweth down riches, and vomiteth them up again;
Out of his belly God doth cast them.
16 The poison of cobras he sucketh,
The viper's tongue doth slay him.

---

the children, and *their hands* should be read (see phil. n.). Alternatively [10] may, as [11] certainly doès, return to the lifetime of the wicked man; even in his lifetime his children (like himself [b 15]) are reduced to beggary.

11. The wicked man dies in the full bloom and vigour of youth—before he has lived even half the allotted span of human life (Ps. 55[24]).—*Of his youth*] AV. follows 𝔙 in gratuitously prefixing *the sins.*—*The dust*] *i.e.* the grave: cp. 19[25] n.

12–14.—Wickedness is compared to a dainty morsel ([12a. 14a]) which is kept in the mouth as long as possible ([12b]) that full enjoyment may be had from the taste of it ([13]), but which, when it passes into the system, proves poisonous ([14]).

15. A different and coarser (cp. v.[7] n., also Jer. 51[44]) figure derived from eating: the wicked man, in his haste to be rich, gluttonously loads his belly with riches, but God administers an emetic, and he has to part with them again. It is curious that some should connect [15] closely with [14] as continuing the same figure; in helping the wicked to part with what had become poisonous, God would be mitigating the punishment, and this is certainly not Ṣophar's thought.

16. The v. may have been a marginal parallel to [14b] (so Bu.). [b] is, of course, physiologically incorrect; but the darting tongue of the serpent naturally suggested itself as the instrument of death.

17 Let him not look upon the channels of ⌜oil⌝,
The streams of honey and curdled milk.
18 Restoring that which he laboured for, he swalloweth it not down;
According to the gains of his exchange he rejoiceth not!
19 For he hath oppressed (and) forsaken the poor,
He seizeth violently a house, but doth not build it up.
20 Because he knew no quietness in his belly,
He will not escape with his valued possessions.
21 Nothing escaped his greed;
Therefore his prosperity endureth not.
22 In the fullness of his sufficiency he is in straits;
The hand of every one that is in misery cometh upon him.

---

17. *Let him not*] or, *Never can he* . . . ! see phil. n.—*Look upon*] with delight and enjoy the sight of: cp. 33^{28}, Ps. 106^{5} etc.—*Oil*] see phil. n.—*Curdled milk*] a form in which milk was, and, in Syria, still is, specially enjoyed: see n. on Is. 7^{15} (*Isaiah*, p. 129).

18. He cannot retain, or take pleasure corresponding to, his riches. The inconsistency with ^{15} need not be pressed.

19–21. The greedy man acquires and consumes remorselessly (^{19a}) and greedily ($^{20a.\,21a}$); therefore he is not allowed to retain and enjoy his acquisitions.

19. *For*] or rather, if the v. be left unemended, *because*, as in ^{20a}; in all three distichs the first line gives the cause of the moral consequence described in the second line, the cause being formally indicated in $^{19.\,20}$, the consequence in ^{21}. Possibly, however, this similarity did not exist in the original text (see phil. nn.): in that case *for* may here give the reason for ^{18}: and ^{b} (And violently seized a house which he had not built) a second illustration of his violent conduct.—*Build up*] enjoy the possession of: cp. $^{20b.\,21b}$ and see last n.

20. *Because*] 𝔊 om.; Du., following 𝔊, renders ^{a}, He hath no quietness in his treasure—^{a}, then, gives not the cause of ^{b}, but is a parallel statement.

22b. Cp. 5^{5}.

23 **His belly must be filled!**
(God) sendeth forth the heat of his anger upon him,
  And raineth it upon him as his ⌜bread⌝.
24 He may flee from the iron weapon,
  (But) the bow of bronze will strike him through;
25 He draweth it forth, and it cometh out of ⌜his⌝ back;
  And the glittering point out of his gall.
Terrors ⌜are turned⌝ upon him;
26 All darkness is laid up for his treasures.

23a. *Be filled*] "not with the food he loved, but with the rain of Divine judgments" (Ps. 11^{6})—Dr. But the line is probably a gloss or a fragment (see phil. n.), though Bu., if one line must be omitted, would omit ^{b}, which is literal, between two lines that are figurative.—*As his bread*] 𝔐 *into his flesh*; ^{c} is in general, and was originally, perhaps, more closely, parallel to ^{b}; on the interpretation and proposed emendations, see phil. n.

24. The doom of the wicked is certain: if he escape one form of Divine judgment, it is only to fall a victim to another (cp. Am. 5^{19} 9^{1b-4}). Such is the point of the v., if the text of ^{a} in 𝔐 is correct; but since *weapon* (נשק) is elsewhere a general term (39^{21}, 2 K. 10^{2}, Ps. 140^{8}, and, probably, even Ezk. $39^{9f.}$), and collective, it should include bows; in that case the antithesis would be reduced, unsatisfactorily, to *iron* and *bronze*. Possibly in the original text, ^{a} was synonymous with ^{b} (cp. 𝔊), not antithetical. In itself ^{a} certainly does not suggest weapons used at close quarters in contrast to arrows that hit at a distance (Del. Di. al.).—*Bow of bronze*] Ps. 18^{35}: fig. for arrows shot from a powerful bow.

25. Lines $^{a.b}$ continue ^{24}; the *glittering point* of the arrow has pierced his vitals (^{b}) (cp. 16^{13}), before the smitten man can extract it (^{a}). For the rest, owing to corruption of the text, the figure of the v. is blurred; and it must remain uncertain whether the arrow was pictured as piercing the man *in front*, and so passing right through him (𝔊), or as piercing him *in the back* as he flees (^{24a} 𝔐).

25c, 26a are best taken as independent, neither continuing

A fire not blown (by man) devoureth him;
It feedeth on that which is left in his tent.
27 The heavens reveal his iniquity,
And the earth riseth up against him.
28 The increase of his house goeth into exile,
As things swept away in the day of wrath.
29 This is the portion of a wicked man from God,
And the heritage appointed unto him by God.

---

the fig. of [24. 25a. b], nor beginning that of [26b. c]. On the other hand, the distich is anything but a necessary conclusion to [23], and [24. 25a. b] need not be considered out of place (Du.). If it were necessary to find a continuation of [23], it would be better found in [26b. c]. The text is again very uncertain: on [25c], see phil. n. It is strange that in [26a] the calamity destined for *his treasures* (צפוניו), unless indeed this should be taken personally *for his treasured ones* as in Ps. 83[4], should be expressed figuratively by saying that darkness is *laid up* (lit. *hidden*) for them: for treasures are hidden things (3[21]), and darkness suggests security rather than peril for these. A personal term of some kind is required: Me. *for his offspring* (לצאצאיו: cp. 𝔖), Du. *for him* (לו: cp. 𝔊).

26b, c. A fresh fig.: lightning (see phil. n. and cp. 1[16] 15[34] n.) strikes him dead, and destroys what has survived (18[19], phil. n.) previous disasters. That the "fire" is fever is improbable.

27. "Heaven and earth combine to testify to his guilt (viz. by the judgments which they conspire to send against him)"—Dr. A reference to 16[18ff.] 19[25ff.] (Bu.) is far from certain.

28. A return to the judgments after [27] is not very satisfactory; and [27] and [28] may have become accidentally transposed—an accident which would have been facilitated by the similar beginning (יגל) of the first lines of the two distichs.—*Goeth into exile*] similarly Is. 24[11], Hos. 10[5]; but 𝔐 (pointed יִגַּל) may also mean *rolleth away* (like a stream): on this and the questionable text of [b] see phil. n.

29. Cp. 18[21] (for the form of conclusion), 27[13] (for the contents of the v.: also 31[2]).

XXI. 1 Then Job answered and said,
2 Hear diligently my speech;
And let this be your consolation.
3 Suffer me, and *I* will speak,
And after that I have spoken, mock on.

XXI. Job's reply to Ṣophar's second speech.—Vv.$^{2-6}$ introductory; $^{7-18}$ the facts are not as Ṣophar represents; on the contrary, the wicked actually live even to old age, enjoying all manner of prosperity. Why? For ($^{14f.}$) they are even openly defiant of God. No doubt it *sometimes* happens that calamity befalls the wicked; but how often ($^{17f.}$)? Perhaps, too, God punishes the children of the wicked after the fathers are dead; but that does not affect the wicked themselves ($^{19-21}$). For, once life is over, one who has enjoyed prosperity up to the end is no worse off than one who has lived miserably; difference of fortune belongs to life only; the dead share all a common fate ($^{23-26}$). Not only are the friends wrong as to facts, but wrong also in their inference that because Job's house has been destroyed, Job is wicked ($^{27f.}$). It is in those that escape calamity that wickedness might more safely be suspected; but men are afraid to accuse powerful sinners, however patent their sins; they rather cringe before them in their lifetime, and honour them in death ($^{29-33}$).

The emphasis in this speech lies not on Job's suffering in spite of his righteousness, but on the appalling ($^{5f.}$) fact that men prosper in spite of being wicked—an appalling fact since it seems to reflect on God (^{4}); cp. Jer. 12^{1-3}, Ps. 73^{2-12}.

2. The speeches of the friends gave Job no comfort (^{34} 16^{2}: cp. 15^{11}); but their attention, if they will give it, as he propounds this dark riddle of God's conduct, he will accept as such.—*Your consolation*] ct. "the consolations of God," 15^{11} n.

3. After he has spoken, they may, if they can or will, continue to mock.—*Mock on*] in 𝔐 (not 𝔊) the vb. is sing. as addressed to Ṣophar alone: cp. 16^{3} 26^{2} (n.); Bu. thinks the sing. original, and the correct reply to 20^{2} where Ṣophar alone speaks for the friends; but it is difficult to see how 20^{2} could have been in the first pl.

4 As for me, is my complaint of man?
And why should I not be impatient?
5 Mark me, and be astonished,
And lay (your) hand upon (your) mouth;
6 Even when I remember I am dismayed,
And horror taketh hold on my flesh.
7 Wherefore do the wicked live,
Become old, yea, wax mighty in power?
8 Their seed is established with them,
And their offspring before their eyes.
9 Their houses are safe from fear,
Neither is the rod of God upon them.
10 Their bull gendereth, and showeth no loathing;
Their cow calveth, and casteth not her calf.

---

4. Not of men, and therefore not of you, but of God I complain, whose ways with men give me good reason to be impatient.—*Complaint*] 7^{11} (phil. n.) ^{18} 9^{27} 10^{1} 23^{2}.—*Impatient*] 6^{11} n.

5 f. If the friends will lend Job their attention as he expounds his theme, viz., the anomalies of God's moral government and His preferential treatment of the wicked, they will be astounded, as Job himself (^{6}) is already, to find ($^{7ff.}$) that God suffers the wicked to prosper.—*Mark me*] lit. *turn to me*, *i.e.* attentively: the two imperatives form a virtually hypothetical sentence.—*Lay hand upon mouth*] in awe-struck silence: 40^{4}, Mic. 7^{16}.

7. Ct. 20^{5} and, with $^{8.\ 11}$ 20^{10} (Ṣophar); also $18^{5ff.\ 19}$ (Bildad), $15^{20ff.\ 33f.}$ (Eliphaz).

8. The wicked continue to have their children as they grow old (^{7}), their children's children also, about them, and to enjoy the sight of them; they are spared the cruel bereavements which had been multiplied for Job. At present the reference to the children is broken off by $^{9f.}$ and resumed in ^{11}: Bi. Du. place ^{8} after ^{10},—the best and simplest transposition: Me. rearranged vv.$^{7-11}$ in the order $^{7.\ 8.\ 11.\ 10.\ 9}$.

9. *Safe from fear*] prosperous (5^{24}), with no fear of unwelcome change.—b. Another contrast to Job's lot: see 9^{34}.

10. No accident hinders the increase of their herd.—*Their*]

[11] They send forth their young ones like a flock,
And their children dance.
[12] They sing to the timbrel and harp,
And rejoice at the sound of the pipe.
[13] They ⌜end⌝ their days in prosperity,
And in a moment go down to Sheol.

---

so 𝔊: 𝔐 *his*, and so in [b] in reference to the individual wicked man: cp. [19ff.].—*Showeth no loathing*] or *causeth not* (the cow) *to loathe* (see phil. n.).

11. Their children are as free from care as small cattle let loose on the pastures.—*They send forth their young ones*] so 𝔐 (יְשַׁלְּחוּ); better, because a closer parallel to the intrans. vb. in [b], *their young ones are sent forth*, or *let loose* (יְשֻׁלְּחוּ, Σ προβάλλονται, 𝔙 *egrediuntur*). For this idea expressed by the vb. cp. Is. 32^{20}.—*Like a flock*] as little here as in Ps. $114^{4.6}$ is the point of comparison the *number* of the flock (Du. Bu. Peake); the point, as in [b], is the careless, joyous freedom of the children. —*Dance*] cp. Ps. $114^{4.6}$—there of animals skipping about in terror at the storm (cp. Ps. 29^{6}), here of the dance of joy (cp. Ec. 3^{4}). The line is short, and has possibly lost the clause *like rams* (cp. Ps. 114^{4}), parallel to *like a flock*; if not, the comparison is implicit.

12–13. The wicked live a merry life ([12]), and die an easy death ([13]). The instruments mentioned in [12] are (1) the *timbrel, i.e.* the tambourine—an instrument of percussion; (2) the *harp* or *lyre* (see Dr. *Amos*, p. 236 f.)—in any case a stringed instrument; and (3) *the pipe* (bag-pipe) or *flute* (𝔗), or *Pan's pipe* (𝔙)—in any case the term (עוגב, 30^{31}, Gn. 4^{21}, Ps. $150^{4\dagger}$) probably denotes a wind instrument rather than another stringed instrument (𝔊 in Gn. 4^{21}): see, further, *EBi. s.v.* Music. (1) and (2) are mentioned together as used for joyous music in Gn. 31^{27}, Is. 24^{8}, and (together with other instruments) Is. 5^{12}.

13. *End*] 𝔐 lit. *wear out*; but see phil. n.—*In a moment*] and therefore painlessly, not, like Job, lingeringly and painfully; or *in tranquillity*, see phil. n.

14 f. All these tokens of God's favour are shown to the

14 Yet they said unto God, "Depart from us,
For we desire not the knowledge of thy ways.
15 What is the Almighty, that we should serve him?
And what profit should we have, if we pray unto him?"
16 Lo, ⌜is⌝ not their prosperity in their hand?
(The counsel of the wicked is far from me.)

---

wicked ($^{7-13}$), in spite of the fact that they had treated God with disdain, and lived regardless of Him.

15. If men prosper, though they disregard God, they naturally and cheerfully conclude that nothing is to be gained by regarding Him; the same conclusion is uttered in despair at the sight of the prosperous wicked by impatient "servants" of God in Mal. 3^{14} 2^{17}.

16. On the text of [a] followed in the translation, see below: 𝔐 reads: Lo, their prosperity is not in their hand. Line [b] recurs in 22^{18b}, and possibly [a] and 22^{18a} are merely variants, as Du. suggests, who considers the v. in place here and out of place there. On the other hand, Bu. suspects [b] of having here extruded a more exact parallel to [a]. The line is rhythmically more in place in 22^{18} (see phil. n.), if the text there is correct.

"The v. has been very differently understood: (1) taking the words [in 𝔐] as Job's own: their prosperity is not in their own hands to retain (but is secured to them by God): so Di. Del.; (2) expressing the same sense by a change of text: (*a*) 𝔊 Me. Be. (omitting לא), Behold, their prosperity is in their hands (*i.e.* secure); (*b*) Be. (alt.) הֲלֹא for הֵן לֹא, Du. הֵן הֲלֹא, (Behold,) is not their prosperity in their hands (*i.e.* secure)?—Du. continuing, (Is not) the counsel of the wicked far from Him (מִמֶּנּוּ)? viz. from God (who does not concern Himself with their projects: 𝔊 ἔργα δὲ ἀσεβῶν οὐκ ἐφορᾷ); (3) making the words an *objection*, quoted by Job: their prosperity is not in their own hands to retain (but may be lost by them at any moment); so RVm. (prefixing, *Ye say*), Schl. Kamph. Hi. Bu. (1) cannot be said to give a natural sense to the Heb. words of [a]: if that sense is thought to be required, it is better to change the text (2 *a* or *b*); and though the omission seems violent, it is, of course, possible that a scribe, finding it said that the prosperity of the wicked was in their own hands, inserted לא, regardless of the context, to make the statement more orthodox. (3) gives an excellent sense, but there is nothing in the text to indicate that the words are not Job's own: however, the same objection might be raised on ^{19a} (cp. 24^{18}), where the words [in 𝔐] are certainly not Job's. [b] will be a protestation,—whether in Job's mouth or in that of the objector,—that the speaker does not suffer himself to be led into sin by the sight of the prosperity of the un-

17 How often is it that the lamp of the wicked is put out?
  That their calamity cometh upon them?
  That cords ⌜seize them⌝ in his anger?
18 That they are as stubble before the wind,
  And as chaff that the whirlwind carrieth away?
19 (Ye say), "God layeth up his iniquity for his children."
  Let him recompense it unto himself, that he may know it!

---

godly: it would be more forcible and pointed in Job's mouth (who believes in their prosperity: above, 1 and 2) than in the objector's mouth (who realizes that it is precarious: above, 3)."—Dr.

17 f. Sometimes, no doubt, calamity befalls the wicked, and they perish by an untimely fate: yet not as the friends maintain regularly, but only exceptionally. With $^{17a. b}$ cp. $18^{5a. 12b}$ (Bildad), with ^{c} 18^{10-12}, with ^{18a} Ps. 1^{4}, and with ^{18b} 27^{20} (? Ṣophar).—*Cords seize them*] 𝔐 *cords*, or less probably *pains* (properly *birth-pains*) or *portions*, *He distributes*: see phil. n.

19. In ^{a} Job is either citing from the friends (cp. on ^{16}), in order to reject it in what follows, a plea that the wicked are punished in the sufferings of their children; or, if we read (see phil. n.), *Let not* (*God*) *lay up*, etc., he is already in ^{a} rejecting such a plea. In any case, in $^{19b. 20. 21}$ he goes on to urge that punishment inflicted on a wicked man's children when the man is dead is no justification of God's government; for, since once dead the man is beyond suffering in his own person, and also beyond knowing that his children suffer, he, the guilty, entirely escapes, they, the innocent, suffer: the plea, therefore, after all in no way assists the case of the friends, but rather supports Job's position, for it really states a particular illustration of what Job is all along maintaining to be the general rule in life, viz. that the innocent suffer, the guilty prosper. The friends, it is true, have nowhere expressly urged that the children suffer *instead of* the guilty fathers; in 5^{4} (Eliphaz) 20^{10} (Ṣophar) the suffering of their children is rather an additional element in the punishment of the wicked. But Job has just previously challenged the main thesis of the friends, that the wicked are themselves *regularly* overtaken by calamity: what in effect

20 Let his own eyes see his ⌜calamity⌝,
And let him drink of the wrath of the Almighty!
21 For what interest hath he in his house after him,
When the number of his months is finished?
22 Will any teach God knowledge,
Seeing *he* judgeth those that are on high?

---

he does here, if in ^{19a} he is citing their plea, is to argue that if, as a fact, the wicked themselves generally (cp. $^{17f.}$) escape punishment, it is irrelevant whether as a matter of fact after their death their children suffer or do not. With this criticism of the principle that on account of the solidarity of the class or family innocent members of it are legitimate objects of punishment due to guilty members (which led to such applications of the blood feud as are illustrated in 2 S. 21 and such sanctions of law as that in Ex. 20^{5}), cp. Ezk. 18$^{2ff.}$, Jer. 31$^{29f.}$.—*That he may know it*] experience, feel it: cp. Is. 9^{1}, Hos. 9^{7}, Ezk. 25^{14}.

20. 𝔐 unsuitably *craft*: "destruction" (EV) is merely a conjectural and wrong translation of 𝔐.—*Drink*] a piquant figure for feel the effects of: see, *e.g.*, Is. 51^{17}.

21. *Interest*] חפץ as 22^{3}. He can have no interest in what goes on in his old home, for being dead he knows nothing about it (14$^{21f.}$: cp. Ec. 9$^{5f.}$). Quite improbable is the view (Ew. Del.) that the meaning is: During his lifetime the wicked has no interest in what will go on in his home after he is dead.

22. Can any mortal, will you in particular whom I am addressing, instruct *God* (cp. Is. 40^{14})? Such a notion is absurd. He has the knowledge to judge (cp. 22^{13}) the inhabitants of heaven (cp. 25^{2} 4^{18} 15^{15}), *à fortiori* He knows all about earth and how to govern men. Such is the most natural interpretation of the v. taken by itself: the difficulty is to relate it satisfactorily to its present position. Job is commonly understood to be suggesting that the friends speak and act as though they could teach God: so, *e.g.*, Da., "By insisting on a doctrine of providence which did not correspond to God's providence as actually seen in facts, Job's friends

23 One dieth in his very completeness,
Being wholly at ease and quiet:
24 His pails are full of milk,
And the marrow of his bones is moistened.

---

were making themselves wiser than God and becoming His teachers." But the friends accept their reading of the facts of life without question; they never suggest that those facts could be better or ought to be other than they are: Job, it is true, urges that the friends describe God's action incorrectly (cp. [27ff. 24]); but incorrect or even dishonest description of what a person does do cannot naturally be regarded as teaching that person what he should do. On the other hand, Job, who arraigns God's actions and suggests that the facts of life might and ought to be other than they are, might not unnaturally be asked this question. Accordingly others (*e.g.* Hi.) have seen in v.[22] a charge against Job cited (cp. [16. 17]) from the friends. Unfortunately this suggestion also breaks down, for in what follows Job makes no reply to the charge (ct. [17f. 19b–21]). It is possible to translate [a] differently: Will any for (cp. 13[7]) God teach knowledge? So Ehrlich, who understands the v. to mean, can any man on behalf of God explain such facts of earthly life as are described in [23–27]: God cannot Himself give the explanation, being so occupied with the affairs of heaven as not to notice what men are doing on earth. Du. translates [a] in the same way and, emending רמים to רמיה, renders [b], Seeing that he judges deceit, and sees in the v. an angry protest against a dogma which takes no account of reality. But these explanations also are not convincing, and in its present context the v. seems to defy explanation.

23–26. Inequality, difference of fortune in life—ease for some, misery for others, but equality, a common fate, in death; then for all alike the dust and the worm. In *this* life, if justice is to be done, the wicked must suffer ([20f.]).

24. *Pails*] see phil. n.: EV. *breasts* like the VV. not unnaturally seeks a closer parallel to "bones" in [b]; but for this emendation is required.—**b.** "He is well-nourished and prosperous (cp. Pr. 3[8])"—Dr. Ct. Ps. 32[4(3)].

25 And another dieth with a bitter soul,
And never tasteth of good.
26 They lie down alike in the dust,
And the worm covereth them.
27 Behold, I know your thoughts,
And the plots (wherewith) ye deal violently against me;
28 For ye say, "Where is the house of the noble?
And where is the tent wherein the wicked dwelt?"
29 Have ye not asked them that go by the way?
And do ye not regard their tokens?

---

25. *A bitter soul*] 3^{20} n.—*And never tasteth of*] never through life having tasted any *good* (19^{25}), *i.e.* experienced any good fortune or happiness.

26. *Lie down in the dust*] 7^{21}.—b. cp. Is. 14^{11b}.—*The worm*] 17^{14}.

27 ff. The arguments of the friends spring from hostility to Job (27), and are based on a false and dishonest description of facts (34): they argue, wicked men go to ruin; Job has gone to ruin; Job is wicked; but the major premiss is false. as they must or ought to know: any traveller could tell them that wicked men are kept from calamity in life, and after death are honoured.

27. (*Wherewith*) *ye deal violently*] "read, perhaps, *which ye search out*, or *which ye devise*" (Dr.)—see phil. n.

28. *For*] or, *when*; but in the latter case, 28 is better made the conclusion of 27 (Bu.) than a protasis of which 29 is the apodosis (Di.).—*Ye say*] the questions which follow are not cited verbally from the friends, but they correctly summarize such passages as 15^{34} (Eliphaz), 8^{15} $18^{15.21}$ (Bildad).—*Where?*] = nowhere: cp. *e.g.* 4^7: the houses where once the wicked dwelt and seemed to flourish have vanished.

29. *Them that go by the way*] travellers: in La. 1^{12} 2^{15}, Ps. 80^{13} 89^{42}, Pr. 9^{15} *passers-by*, with less if any suggestion that the persons in question have travelled far.—*Tokens*] the word (אות), commonly rendered "sign," here means typical illustrations drawn by those travellers from their experience of men and life that (30) wicked men do not come to ruin.

30 That the evil man is spared ⌜in⌝ the day of calamity?
That they are ⌜delivered in⌝ the day of wrath?
31 Who doth declare his way to his face?
And if *he* hath done a thing, who doth repay him?
32 And *he* is borne to the grave,
And keepeth watch over the tomb.
33 The clods of the valley are sweet unto him,
And all men draw after him,
As there were innumerable before him.

---

30. *In . . . delivered in*] 𝔐 *for . . . led along to*—impossible in the context, and probably (the prepositions at least) due to a dogmatic correction of the text: see phil. n.—*Wrath*] *i.e* God's wrath: cp. Is. 26[20].

31. Wicked men are not only spared by God (v.[29]), but are also left unrebuked by man. It is more natural to take this v as resuming Job's own description of the wicked than as continuing the testimony of the travellers.

32. Honour and good fortune continue to be the lot of the wicked in death: they are buried with pomp ([32a]), provided with a (fine) tomb ([32b]), and laid in sweet soil ([33a]). Job imaginatively endows his wicked men with sentiency even in death (ct. [26]): they enjoy the sweetness of their grave, and (perhaps) look with satisfaction on the sepulchral monument erected in their honour. Not to enjoy such things as these, does Job demand for himself a moment of sentiency after death (19[26]).—*Borne*] 10[19].—*The grave*] a stately grave; see phil. n. on 17[1].—*Keepeth watch*] the subject may be as in [a] the wicked man regarded as sentient (cp. [33a]), or indef. *and men keep watch*, or *and watch is kept*, *i.e.* his tomb is carefully guarded, and his memory kept alive (ct. 18[17]).

33. *Valley*] properly *torrent-valley*, *wady*, if not rather *dust*; see phil. n. For the valley in which Moses was buried (Dt. 34[6]), to which Hi. appeals as a parallel, a different term (גיא) is used. [b.c] have been understood as meaning (1) though he does not escape the evil of death, yet in dying he only shares the lot of all who ever have been or will be (Del.); and for the wicked, even death, when it comes, comes sweetly: or (2), the wicked,

34 How then comfort ye me with vanity,
Seeing that of your answers there remaineth (nought but) faithlessness.

---

in consequence of the attractiveness of his lot, finds innumerable imitators, as he himself followed the attractive path of innumerable wicked men before him (Ew. Di. Da. Dr. Peake). It is on the whole probable that whoever wrote [c] intended to express one of these two ideas. But is [c] original, or an addition (Du. Be.[K])? Certainly, if [b] stood without [c], it would most naturally be understood of the thronging procession that followed the wicked man to his grave, and in this case the hyperbole in "all men" would be more natural than in (2); for Job does not hold that all men are wicked. Hi. pertinently cites from Burckhardt the Arabic proverb: "The bier of a stranger—no man before it or behind it," which might even justify taking [b] and [c] in this sense, but that the idea comes late after [a]. It is noticeable that at present [b.c] form strange second and third lines of a distich to [a] as a first line: and also that the funeral pomp is at present rather briefly expressed in [32a]: possibly [33c] was added by a glossator after [32a. 33b], a distich describing the funeral pomp, and [33a. 32b], a distich describing the feelings imaginatively attributed to the wicked after death, had become dislocated.

34. *Comfort*] [2]: 16[2].—*With vanity*] with unreal assertions such as that Job might prosper again, if he would confess and turn away from his sins, whereas in reality the beginning and condition of prosperity is wickedness. All that the friends say is but a dishonest attempt to prove him wicked.

XXII. The third speech of Eliphaz.—God derives no advantage from men, whether they are good or bad; but men themselves derive advantage (viz. prosperity) from being righteous ([2f.]). For, of course, God does not make Job suffer ([10f.]) because he had been pious ([4]), but because he had sinned manifoldly ([5]), treating men inhumanly ([6-9]), and God as of no account in human affairs ([12-14]); yet how mistakenly, for wicked men in the past, as he does now, had paid dearly for their disregard of God ([15-20]). Yet, even now, if he would let

XXII. 1 Then answered Eliphaz the Temanite, and said,
2 Can a man be profitable unto God?
Nay, he that doeth wisely is profitable unto himself.
3 Is it any interest to the Almighty, that thou art righteous?
Or gain, that thou makest thy ways perfect?
4 Is it for thy fear (of him) that he reproveth thee,
That he entereth with thee into judgment?

God rule his life and abandon unrighteousness, prosperity might return to him ($^{21-30}$).

Eliphaz had already, in his second speech, directly charged Job with impious speech concerning God ($15^{4f.}$); but it is a new feature, the only new feature, of the third speech, that he directly accuses Job of specific sins against men; in this respect Eliphaz is in his last speech most severe in his treatment of Job; and yet he, the kindliest of the friends, closes even this speech as he had closed the first (5^{17-27}), with a picture of the felicity that might yet be obtained by Job, and an appeal to him to take that course which alone can secure it.

2-4. God has nothing to gain from men; therefore Job's sufferings cannot be traced to any self-seeking motive in God. They must be traced, then, to something in Job; and, since it would be absurd to trace it to his piety, it must be traced to sin in him. Such seems to be the argument, but certainly "Eliphaz puts his point rather strangely" (Peake).

2a, 3. Cp. 7^{20}, where Job urges that man's *sin* cannot affect God: Eliphaz combines both points that neither can man's righteousness benefit, nor his sin injure, God ($35^{6f.}$). With ^{2b} cp. 35^{8}, where the effect of man's action is limited to men, but not to the particular actor.

3. *Interest*] 21^{21} n.: here note the parallel term "gain." EV. "pleasure" is misleading: Eliphaz is not denying that God may derive pleasure, but that he derives benefit, from human righteousness.—b^{β}. Cp. 4^{6b}, "The perfectness of thy ways."

4. *Thy fear*] *i.e.* thy religion; cp. 4^{6} (n.) 15^{4}.—*Reproveth*] 5^{17}.

5 Is not thy wickedness great?
Neither is there any end to thine iniquities.
6 For thou takest pledges of thy brother for nought,
And strippest the naked of their clothing.
7 Thou givest not water to the weary to drink,
And from the hungry thou withholdest bread.
8 And the man with the arm, he had the land,
And the man of repute, he dwelt in it.

5b. Or, the force of the interrogative in [a] extending to [b]: And are not thine iniquities endless?

6–9. Specific charges (solemnly repudiated in $31^{19f. 16f. 21}$) that Job has harshly treated (1) fellow-clansmen fallen into his debt ([6]); (2) the faint and hungry ([7]); (3) widows and orphans ([9]). The lines, except in [9a], where the pf. appears for variety, are frequentatives, indicating Job's constant practice.

6. Not two charges, but the two parallel lines supplement one another: the accusation is not that Job took pledges for money lent, nor even merely that he did so *for nought*, *i.e.* for fictitious or trivial debts, or (cp. 2^3 9^{17}) without good ground, such as his own necessity; but that he took clothing in pledge, and thereby reduced his debtors to nakedness. To lend to a *fellow-Hebrew on interest* was altogether forbidden by Hebrew law (Ex. $22^{24 (25)}$); to lend and to take something in pledge as security was permitted, but with the proviso that such pledges should not involve harsh treatment, such as, *e.g.*, depriving a man of his means of living (Dt. 24^6), or of covering by night (Ex. $22^{25 (26)}$, Dt. $24^{12. 13}$). It is of such harsh and unconscionable treatment of those to whom he had lent that Job is here accused: cp. $24^{3. 9}$, Am. 2^8, Ezk. 18^{12}.

7. Job with all his wealth had withheld food from the needy: cp. Mt. $25^{42. 35}$, Is. $58^{7. 10}$.—*Weary*] or faint from thirst: cp. Pr. 25^{25}, Is. 29^8; so of unwatered land, Is. 32^2, Ps. 63^2.

8. Oblique references to Job; ct. the direct address in [6. 7. 9a]. The v. may well be out of place (Sgf. Bu. Peake); if not, it appears to be a covert charge of harshly dispossessing the needy from their land in order to add their estates to his own: cp. Is. 5^8.—*The man with the arm*] the man who had power

9 Thou has sent widows away empty,
And the arms of the fatherless are crushed.
10 Therefore traps are round about thee,
And sudden terror dismayeth thee.
11 Thy ⌜light⌝ is darkened that thou seest not,
And abundance of waters doth cover thee.
12 Is not God as lofty as heaven?
And behold the ‸ stars, how high they are!

(cp. 35^{9}), and exercised it regardless of justice or humanity.—*He had the land . . . he dwelt*] or, *his is the land* (viz. according to thy principles) . . . *he should dwell* (viz. as thou holdest), so Dr.; cp. Di. Rather differently Bu.: "As Job left the helpless and poor in the lurch, and even ill-treated them, so on the other hand he left all power in the hands of the powerful."

9. *The arms . . . are crushed*] *i.e.* orphans are deprived of support: for the fig. cp. Ps. 37^{17} "the arms of the wicked are broken, but Yahweh supporteth the righteous"; for *arm* used figuratively, see ^{8} 35^{9}, Ps. $83^{9\,(8)}$ "they have become an arm (*i.e.* have given help, support) to the children of Lot."

10a. The fig. used by Bildad (18^{8-10}) for calamity closing in on the wicked in general, Eliphaz here applies directly to Job; so in ^{11a} Bildad's figure in 18^{6}.—*Traps*] 18^{9a}.—**b.** Cp. 18^{11a}.

11a. Cp. 18^{6} (Bildad). 𝔐, Or seest thou not the darkness? and this is understood to mean: Dost thou not even yet understand the meaning of the darkness, *i.e.* the calamities, in which you are involved on account of your sin? (so Di. Da.). 𝔐 is no more probable if (cp. EV.) taken as a second subj. to the vb. in ^{10b}, Or darkness (dismayeth thee) that thou seest not.—**b.** For waters or floods as a fig. of calamity, see 11^{16} (Ṣophar) n. The line recurs in 38^{34}, where the waters are literal.

12. The belief in God's transcendence or, as the Hebrews expressed it concretely, the belief that God dwelt in heaven, led in different minds to different conclusions; (1) the pious concluded: from such a lofty vantage ground God sees everything that men do on earth, Ps. 14^{2} $33^{13f.}$; but (2) the impious drew the opposite conclusion: God, being so far withdrawn from men, neither sees nor takes account of what they do: so

13 And thou sayest, "What doth God know?
Can he judge through the thick darkness?
14 Thick clouds are a covering to him, that he seeth not;
And he walketh on the vault of heaven."

Ps. $10^{4f.}$. The second of these conclusions is here attributed to Job by Eliphaz in $^{13-18}$. It is commonly supposed that Eliphaz in ^{12} is indicating the first as his own. Yet it is curious that all he actually does in ^{12} is to emphasize the common starting-point of the two opposite conclusions: he certainly does not *express* the conclusion he himself would draw from it. Du., therefore, omits this v. as a marginal citation to $^{13f.}$ Job's erroneous conclusion ($^{13f.}$) is challenged by an appeal to history as Eliphaz read it: the untimely death of wicked men ($^{15f.}$) is proof that God does judge men in spite of His transcendence. If $^{17f.}$ are in place, Eliphaz seeks still further to discredit Job's conclusion by the statement that it was wicked men who held it.—*As lofty as heaven*] cp. 11^{8} (Ṣophar).—*The stars*] 𝔐 *the head of the stars*, which has been explained, precariously, as meaning the highest stars: judge how high is God's abode by looking at the highest point of heaven. Or, changing the punctuation, we may render, And He (God) beholds the top of the stars; but this too is strange and improbable, and, if it were right, would enhance the difficulty of the connection of ^{12} with $^{13ff.}$: for to say that God sees the top of the stars, *i.e.* presumably the side turned away from earth, would in no way invalidate the conclusion attributed to Job, that God does not see what goes on far below the stars. See phil. n.

13. *And thou sayest*] in what follows Eliphaz attributes to Job more than and other than he had said in c. 21; Job's point was not that God *could* not see or judge what went on on earth: but that as a matter of fact He allowed the wicked to prosper. So, if 21^{22} is original, Job says indeed that God does judge the inhabitants of heaven, but not that He *could* not, if He would, judge the inhabitants of earth as well. "Job observes reality, Eliphaz is always theologizing and assumes that Job does so too" (Du.).—*Through*] (looking) out through: *Lex.* 126*a*.

14. *On the vault*] above the clouds (cp. ^{8}): see phil. n.

15 Wilt thou keep the old way
  Which wicked men did tread?
16 Who were snatched away before their time,
  Whose foundation was poured out as a stream:
17 Who said unto God, "Depart from us";
  And, "What can the Almighty do to ⌜us⌝"?
18 Yet he filled their houses with good things:
  But the counsel of the wicked is far from me!

---

15 f. Either: wilt thou persist in that unbelief in God's judgment which wicked men from the earliest times down to the present have cherished, and like them perish untimely? Or, with specific reference to some event of ancient days, whether the Deluge (so most), or, since ^{20b} does not fit the Deluge story, some other (Ew. Du. Peake): wilt thou perish in unbelief like that of the men in the well-known ancient story who refused to believe that God's judgment was coming, but perished by it none the less? Do you want to follow that ancient path that led then and will lead now to destruction?

15. *Keep the . . . way*] continue to walk in the way: cp. Ps. 18^{22}, Pr. 2^{20}.—*The old way*] cp. "the (good) old paths," Jer. 6^{16}. In such phrases old (עלם) may imply existing formerly and also now (*e.g.* "the old, or everlasting, hills"), or, existing formerly, but no longer now (*e.g.* "the days of old"). Here, if the allusion is to a specific past generation of men, it would naturally be used in the second sense, but "wilt thou keep" implies that it has the first, which it would naturally have, if the allusion is general and not specific.

16b. Fig. as 4^{19}: whose life was ruined from its foundations: or, literally, the foundations of whose houses were carried away by the Deluge.

17, 18. $^{17a} = 21^{14a}$; ^{b}, cp. 21^{15a}; ^{18a}, cp. 21^{16a}; $^{18b} = 21^{16b}$. An elaborate retort in Job's own words to Job's assertion that those who dismissed God from their lives prospered: on the contrary, Eliphaz asserts, it is those who come to ruin who have dismissed God. Such a retort in itself is not unnatural or improbable; but these verses are open to suspicion of being secondary: for (1) the purpose of such a retort has already been

19 The righteous ⌜saw⌝ it, and were glad:
And the innocent laugh them to scorn:
20 (Saying), "Surely ⌜their substance⌝ is cut off,
And their affluence the fire hath devoured."
21 Accustom, now, thyself to him, and be at peace:
Thereby will thine increase be good.
22 Receive, I pray thee, direction from his mouth,
And lay up his words in thine heart.

---

attained in 13–16; (2) 17f. interrupt the connection between the picture of judgment on the wicked in 15f. and the emotion and comment of the righteous called forth by it (19f.). Accordingly Bu. Du. Peake omit 17f.; Me. Sgf. omit 18 only.—*To us*] 𝕸 *to them*: but see phil. n.

19. The past tenses (see phil. n.) are likely to be right if the allusion in 15f. is to a specific event (see on 15f.); but if the reference there is general, the frequentatives of 𝕸 should be retained here: *the righteous see* the fate which habitually befalls the wicked *and are glad*. The frequentatives would make the v. as a retort to 17^8 (Bu.) more pointed, but see on 17^8. With [a], cp. Ps. 107^{42}.

20. *Their substance is*] so 𝔊: 𝕸 is supposed to mean *those that rose up against us*: but see phil. n.—*Their affluence*] יתרם: so Ps. 17^{14}, cp. יתרה, Is. 15^7. "The remnant of them" (EV.) is not a preferable rendering, even if 𝕸 in [a] is retained.—*The fire*] 15^{34} n.

21–30. There is still hope of happiness and prosperity for Job if he but leaves the way of the wicked and returns to God. This conclusion resembles that of Eliphaz's first speech, and contrasts with the dark close of the second speech.

21. If you will but acquiese in His dealings with you, you will find yourself at peace with Him, and your life prosperous. On [b], see phil. n.

22. *Direction*] תורה ‖ *words* (אמריו): cp. Is. 5^{24} (‖ אמרה), 1^{10} (‖ דבר). Cp. also the use of the term of human directions or instructions (*e.g.* Pr. 1^8 7^2). The words of God that are to direct Job aright are given in 23ff.: Eliphaz is the mediator of a divine revelation: cp. $4^{12ff.}$ 5^{27} 15^{11}.

23 If thou return to the Almighty, ⌜and humble thyself⌝;
If thou put away unrighteousness far from thy tents;
24 And lay gold-ore in the dust,
And (gold of) Ophir among the rocks of the wadys;
25 Then will the Almighty be thy gold-ore,
And ⌜his direction⌝ will be silver unto thee;
26 For then thou wilt delight thyself in the Almighty,
And lift up thy face unto God.
27 Thou wilt make thy prayer unto him, and he will hear thee;
And thy vows thou wilt perform.
28 Thou wilt also decree a thing, and it will be established unto thee;
And light shall shine upon thy ways.
29 For ⌜God⌝ abase⌜th⌝ pride,
But him that is lowly of eyes he saveth.

---

23. *And humble thyself*] 𝔐 *thou shalt be built up*: but see phil. n.

24. Let Job no more place his confidence in gold (31^{24}), but rather throw it away as worthless.—*Gold of Ophir*] climactic after gold-ore: cp. 28^{16}. On identifications of the land of Ophir whence this highly-prized gold came, see *EBi.* and *DB*, *s.v. Ophir*.

25. Possibly Eliphaz speaks with a recollection of the meaning of his own name, my God is fine gold: Job will have the same enjoyment of God as Eliphaz has.—*And his direction will be silver*] RV. "and precious silver" (as a second predicate to the "Almighty" in [a])—a conjectural rendering of 𝔐: see phil. n. *Direction* as v.[22]; for the sentiment, cp. Ps. 19^{11}.

26. With [a] cp. 27^{10a}, Is. 58^{14}; with [b] cp. 27^{10b}.—*Lift up thy face*] in confidence, to see Him and to show Him a face free from trace of shame and guilt: cp. 11^{15}: ct. 10^{15}.

27b. is parallel to the second half of [27a]: Job will have occasion to pay his vows, because God will have granted the prayer for the fulfilment of which the vows were promised.

28b. Ct. v.[11a].

29a. 𝔐 is unintelligible and cannot bear the meaning, even if that were suitable, placed upon it in RV. See phil. n.

30 He delivereth the innocent ⌜man⌝,
 And ⌜thou shalt⌝ be delivered through the cleanness of thy hands.

---

30. The metrically questionable and otherwise very improbable text of 𝔐 reads: He delivereth him that is not innocent, and he is delivered, through the cleanness of thy hands: this has been understood to mean that God, on account of Job's innocence, delivers the guilty; it would then be an unconscious anticipation on the part of Eliphaz of what happens subsequently to himself (42^{8}). Even as emended, the text (on other emendations see phil. n.) is not a very forcibly expressed conclusion to the speech.

XXIII., XXIV. Job's reply to Eliphaz's third speech. —Unlike any of the previous replies (but cp. cc. 3, 29–31), this speech contains no direct address to the friends: the whole might be monologue. The speech falls into two main divisions corresponding to the two chapters: (1) c. 23—the riddle presented by God's treatment of Job; (2) c. 24—by His treatment of men generally. Partly on the ground of form, partly on the ground of substance, much or all (except the last v.) of c. 24 has been regarded as added to, or substituted for a part of, the original text. But that Job should, as in his previous speech (c. 21), carry his consideration of the riddle beyond its purely personal reference is likely enough, and 24^{25} forms, as is indeed admitted by most, an altogether probable ending for a speech of Job. The exceedingly corrupt state of the text complicates decision on the critical problem: see further on c. 24. Assuming c. 24 to be in the main genuine, the speech may be summarized briefly thus: Job, suffering still (23^{1}), still longs to find God and argue his case with Him ($^{2-7}$); but he cannot do so ($^{8f.}$): could he, he is certain what the issue would be, for God really knows as well as Job himself Job's steadfast adherence to the right ($^{10-12}$). Yet since, in spite of this, God is evidently bent on carrying through His harsh treatment of him, there is no escape for Job (for what God wills, He does), but only dismay and darkness ($^{13-17}$). The same disregard of right by God which Job feels in his own case, he perceives in

XXIII. 1 And Job answered and said,
2 Even to-day is my complaint ⌈bitter⌉;
⌈His⌉ hand is heavy upon my groaning.

---

others (^{14b}); so that his question is more than personal; it is not merely, Why must I suffer? but, Why do so many victims of wickedness suffer, God remaining all the time indifferent and inactive (24^{1})? For the wicked pursue their nefarious practices ($^{2-4}$), their victims suffer ($^{5-12}$), and God takes no account (^{12c}). Three classes of those who shun the light are described ($^{13-17}$). Vv.$^{18-24}$ are through textual corruption altogether obscure or ambiguous, but in part they apparently describe the fate of the wicked as unhappy ($^{18-20}$), in part ($^{21f. ?\, 24}$) as happy. In the concluding v. (^{25}) Job insists that his descriptions have been true to facts. In all this Job makes no direct reference to what Eliphaz had just said; but indirectly he traverses his two main points: against Eliphaz's accusations ($22^{6ff.}$), he insists on his innocence and integrity ($23^{7.\, 10-12}$); against Eliphaz's closing appeal to him to return to God, he expresses his longing to find God; but God is not to be found.

2. *Even to-day*] or *to-day also*; this seems to imply that the debate lasted more than one day, and suggests that Eliphaz's third speech marked the beginning of the third day's discussion; and that this v. is thus Job's first remark on the day in question. On emendations suggested to avoid this implication, see phil. n. —*Complaint*] 21^{4} n.; complaint, *i.e.* complaining, is here closely associated with acute suffering; note the parallel "groaning" and cp. 7^{13}. Job's sufferings still draw from him bitter complaining and groans.—*Bitter*] cp. 7^{11}; 𝔐 *defiant*, which would mean that Job is as little inclined as ever to admit that God was dealing justly with him, and as little likely as ever to satisfy Eliphaz: see phil. n.—*His hand* (יד as 19^{21}, cp. כף, 13^{21}) *is heavy*] cp. Ps. 32^{4}, 1 S. 5^{6}; in spite of Job's groaning (3^{24}) under sufferings already inflicted, God afflicts him still; so 𝔊𝔖. 𝔐 has *my hand*, which is supposed to mean: I do my best to check my groaning, but in vain: see phil. n.; on AV. "my stroke is heavier than my groaning," see also Da.

3 Oh that I knew where I might find him,
That I might come even to his tribunal!
4 I would set out my case before him,
And fill my mouth with arguments.
5 I would know the words which he would answer me,
And understand what he would say unto me.
6 Would he contend with me in the greatness of his power?
Nay: but *he* would give heed unto me.

3–5. Why tell me to return to God (22^{23})? If only I knew where or how to reach Him! That I do not is ground enough in itself for continued complaining. If Job could but reach God, how gladly (cp. 13^{3b}) would he state his own case, and (^{5}) hear God's reply to it. On the cohortatives in $^{4f.}$, see G–K. 108*f*.

4a. Cp. 13^{18}.—*Arguments*] 13^{6}: the vb. 13^{3}.

6f. If only Job could reach God and argue his case before Him, right, not might, would decide, and Job's innocence would for ever be established. Job's attitude has changed since c. 9: there ($^{3.\ 14-20.\ 32f.}$) he is possessed by the thought that, even if he could stand before God, God's might would deflect his right, that God would browbeat and terrify him into making himself out to be guilty; though even there ($^{34f.}$, cp. also 13^{20-22}) he is sure enough that, if God would only abstain from exercising His might to terrify, he could establish his right. In some measure 13^{16} anticipates the present passage; and even here he has no confidence that he will reach God (quite the reverse, $^{8-10}$), and is still convinced that, unheard by God, he must become the victim of His might ($^{13-17}$). Bu., with slight emendations, reads: Behold, in the greatness of His power He might contend with me, If only He [Himself] would give heed to me: in this case Job is reducing his conditions to a minimum: he is now ready to face even God's might, if God will but attend to him.

6. *He*] the exact force of the emphasis has been differently understood: "*He*, being what He is" (Dr.); "God Himself, and not merely a man" (Di.); "He whom I now know as Him who is always on the side of right" (13^{16} 19^{25})—Du.

7 There would an upright man be arguing with him;
 And I should be delivered for ever from my judge.
8 Behold I go forward, but he is not (there);
 And backward, but I perceive him not;
⌈I seek him⌉ on the left hand, but I behold him not;
 ⌈I⌉ turn to the right hand, but I do not see him.
10 For he knoweth the way that I take,
 If he trieth me, I shall come forth as gold.

---

7. *An upright man*] ‖ I = Job the upright (1^{1}); the line is not a general statement (RV.), but a statement of what would take place if Job could find God.

8 f. But Job cannot find God, even with the most persistent seeking. The vv. explicate what is implicit in ^{3}, and interrupt the close connection between ^{7} and ^{10}, and are, perhaps, as Bu. Sgf. Du. conclude, an addition to the original text. 𝔊 omits ^{9} only. The vv. resemble, without however expressing quite the same thought as, $9^{11f.}$, Ps. $139^{5.\ 7-10}$.—*Forward . . . backward . . . left hand . . . right hand*] or, *east . . . west . . north . . . south.*—*Perceive him not . . . do not see him*] cp. 9^{11}: in parallellism with these, *he is not* in ^{8a} means of course: he is not to be found by me.—*I seek him*] 𝔐 *where he works*, in which Del. detects an allusion to the belief that the North is the unfinished part of the world. But that, or where, God works, is not the point of the passage.—*I turn*] 𝔐 *he turns.* RV. "He hideth himself," giving to 𝔐 a meaning possible in itself (see phil. n), but unsuitable: "for what is there remarkable in one not seeing one who hides himself" (Schult.).

10. *For*] If $^{8f.}$ are an addition, $^{10-13}$ originally gave the reason for Job's confidence that he would establish his case, if ever he could come before God: this confidence arises from the fact that his conduct has been right, and he himself true, and that God knows, or (ידע) would come to know, this. If $^{8f.}$ are original, ^{10} must state "the reason why God will not let Himself be found by Job: He knows that he is innocent ($^{10-12}$), but yet will not be diverted ($^{13.\ 14}$) from his hostility towards Him" (Dr.). But in this case the real reason lies in $^{13f.}$, and $^{10-12}$ are virtually concessive: for, though He knows I am innocent, He will not abandon His purpose to treat me as guilty. Rendering

11 My foot hath held fast to his steps;
His way have I kept, and turned not aside.
12 The commandment of his lips—I never seceded (from it);
I have treasured up ⌜in⌝ my bosom the words of his mouth.
13 But he ⌜hath chosen⌝, and who can turn him back?
And his soul desireth (a thing), and he doeth it.
14 For he completeth that which is appointed for me:
And many such things are in his mind.

כי by *but* (so RV.) instead of *for*, Peake explains the connection thus: in spite of God's self-concealment ($^{8f.}$), He still closely watches Job's ways; but if this had been the point, we should have expected $^{8f.}$ to have expressed not Job's fruitless efforts to find God, but God's successful measures to hide Himself from Job; the latter point is, however, not put at all, not even in ^{9b} when correctly read and interpreted.

10b. Cp. Ps. 17^{3}, and with *steps* in ^{11a}, Ps. 17^{5}.

12b. Cp. Ps. 119^{11}. Job had done what Eliphaz exhorts him to do (22^{22}).—*In my bosom*] so 𝔊: cp. "in my heart," Ps. 119^{11}. 𝔐 *from*, or *more than*, *my law*, which has been strangely regarded as anticipating the thought of Ro. 7^{23}.

13–17. But in spite of his steadfastness in the right, Job recognizes that God remains immovable from His determination to treat him harshly.

13. Cp. 9^{12}.—*He hath chosen*] on 𝔐, *paraphrased* in RV., "He is in one mind," see phil. n.

14. The v. appears to contain the application of the general truth, that what God wills, He does (^{13}), to ^{a} Job's destiny, ^{b} the destiny of like sufferers—the theme developed in c. 24; it is obvious that in fact Job is suffering though righteous: this must be because God wills it and prescribes suffering for Job; and He will go on undeterred till the full tale of Job's suffering has been exacted; and the same morally inexplicable course He intends to pursue with others: they are and will be righteous; but God allows, and will allow, them to suffer. But it is curious (1) that this application of ^{14} is expressed in the form of a reason for it—*for* He completeth; and (2) that what

15 Therefore am I dismayed at his presence;
When I consider, I am afraid of him.
16 For God hath made my heart faint,
And the Almighty hath dismayed me;
17 Because I am not undone because of the darkness,
Or because of my own face which thick darkness covereth.

God appoints for Job, viz. that he shall suffer to the last, is not more explicity put; (1) is not very satisfactorily avoided by reading *thus* (Bu.) for *for*; and [15] would be still less adequately prepared for by [13] (which even less explicitly asserts that Job's sufferings will continue), if with 𝔊 [14] were omitted, or with Du. transferred to follow [17]. It is, however, not improbable that [14] was originally differently expressed.—*Completeth*] makes the realization fully correspond to the intent: cp. Is. 44^{26}.—*That which is appointed for me*] viz. my disease hastening on to death: cp. 7^6 9^{25} etc. The same Hebrew word (חק) with different nuances occurs in 14^5 (see phil. n.) [13] 38^{10}. With a mere change of punctuation, [b] may be rendered: *And so* (are, or turn out), such is the result of, *processes at law with him* (so Hoffm.).

15, 16. God alone is the cause of Job's fear: the emphatic words are *at his presence* (lit. *face*), *God*, *the Almighty*.

17. 𝔐, translated as above, is taken to be the negative aspect of what has been said in [15f.]: God, *i.e.* God in the mysterious, inexplicable ways of His providence ([15f.]), not calamity in itself ([17a]), or ([b]) his face disfigured ($19^{13ff.}$) by his calamities, is the cause of Job's being overwhelmed: so Di. Da. Dr. (in *Book of Job*). But this is scarcely less improbable than an earlier explanation of 𝔐 embodied in AV.: God dismays Job, because Job was not allowed to die before calamity came upon him. Under these circumstances most recent commentators have felt driven to emendation, and to read: Because I am undone because of the darkness, And because thick darkness hath covered my face: God dismays Job, because he cannot see the meaning of what He does.

XXIV. With the exception of [25], the whole or a large part of this c. has been regarded by many as interpolated. The

grounds alleged are (1) the difference in poetical form; (2) the unsuitability of the contents to the context.

(1) *The poetical form.*—Me., rejecting $^{9-24}$, claimed that this section consisted of two sets of six tristichs, each preceded by a distich, the distichs being ^{9} and ^{17}, the first set of tristichs $^{10b.\ 11}$, ^{12}, ^{13}, ^{14}, ^{15}, ^{16}, the second ^{18}, ^{19} (a line being assumed to have been lost), ^{20}, $^{21.\ 22a}$, $^{22b.\ 23}$, ^{24}. Bi., rejecting $^{6-8.\ 10-24}$, regarded the remainder, together with 30$^{2-7}$, as a series of tristichs as follows: 24$^{5a.\ b.\ c}$, $^{5d.\ 6}$, $^{7.\ 10a}$, ^{8} 30^{3a}, $^{3b.\ 4}$, $^{5.\ 6a}$, $^{6b.\ 7}$, 24$^{10b.\ 11}$, ^{12}, ^{13}, ^{14}, ^{15}, ^{16}, ^{17} (with three words added), ^{18}, ^{19} (with two words added), ^{20} (with one word added), $^{21.\ 22a}$ (altered), $^{22b.\ 23}$ (altered), ^{24}. Du., rejecting $^{1-24}$, regards these vv. as consisting of four poems $^{1-4}$, $^{5-12}$ (+30$^{2-8}$), $^{13-18a}$, $^{18b-24}$, all written exclusively in tristichs. He divides this c. into the following tristichs: ^{1} (with two words added: see phil. n.), $^{2.\ 3a}$, $^{3b.\ 4}$, $^{5a.\ b.\ c}$, $^{5d.\ 6}$, $^{8.\ 10a}$, $^{10b.\ 11}$, ^{12}, ^{13}, ^{14}, ^{15}, ^{16}, $^{17.\ 18a}$, $^{18b.\ 19}$, ^{20}, $^{21b.\ 22a}$ ($^{20-22a}$ much altered). Du. omits ^{7}, ^{9}, ^{18c}, and makes many changes (mostly noted in the phil. nn.) in the rest of the c. It will be seen that Me. Bi. Du. agree in detecting here tristichs to the entire (Bi. Du.), or almost entire (Me.), exclusion of distichs; though they are not altogether agreed as to the constituent elements of some of the tristichs. If there were actually anything like so great a number of tristichs as even Me. claims, there would undoubtedly be a strong argument from form against this section, for the book of Job consists almost exclusively of distichs with tristichs occurring at most as very infrequent variations. But there is not: some details of form are discussed in the notes: here it may suffice to point out how illegitimately in some, how precariously in other instances, the appearance of tristichs is obtained: Du. divides the obvious parallel lines $^{3a.\ b}$ from one another to give to three distichs the appearance of two tristichs; in ^{1} he expands two lines (one overlong) into three by the conjectural addition of two words; thus in $^{1-4}$ he constructs three tristichs out of an existing text that shows no trace even of one. Me. Bi. Du. agree in finding five consecutive tristichs in $^{12-16}$, and here the existing text (cp. RV.) lends them support; yet the reasons for transposing ^{14c} to follow ^{15c} are very strong; and if the transposition is made, even in this part of the chapter distichs at least intermingle with tristichs. In $^{18-24}$ the text is so corrupt that emendation is justified, not to say imperative; but for that very reason from conjecturally constructed tristichs in this part of the c. no conclusion can safely be drawn that tristichs were exclusively used in the first part of it. The *formal* argument that c. 24 is mainly an interpolation cannot therefore be maintained.

(2) *The nature of the context.*—Though the frequent corruptions of the text, especially in $^{18-24}$, render interpretation in detail extremely uncertain, the chapter clearly has a certain character of its own: Me. finds in $^{9-24}$ a characterization of the way of the world in a series of short popular character sketches presented without passing any moral judgment on the classes described; and Bi. finds the miserable inhabitants of the desert, who are described, neither bad enough to serve as examples of sinners that escape punishment, nor good enough to be a type of good men wronged; vv.$^{6-8.\ 10-24}$ seem to him "a libro quodam gnomico de cursu vitae desumpti." Du., with less probability, detects an eschatological element

XXIV. 1 Why are times not laid up by the Almighty?
And why do not they who know him see his days?
2 ⌜Wicked men⌝ remove land-marks;
They violently take away flocks, and feed them.

in 1-4. Hoffm. places 18-25 after 25[6] as part of Bildad's speech. The nature of the contents is, to a large extent, rightly characterized by Me. and Bi., but it does not necessarily follow that c. 24 is an inappropriate continuation of c. 23; and to Bu. it appears precisely what we ought to expect. In any case, the c. is certainly not throughout a mere cool and unconcerned description of life, in which case it would certainly differ greatly in tone and temper from other speeches of Job; for not only [1], but also [12c], reflect the feeling of the writer, that the facts of life present moral anomalies and raise the question of the moral government of God—in other words, the feeling that constantly underlies and finds expression in Job's speeches.

The passages most open to suspicion of interpolation are (1) the very objective description of the "night-birds," 13-17, which also, even in the original text, perhaps contained an unusual proportion of tristichs, and (2) those parts of 18-24 which refer to the swift doom descending on the wicked.

1. On the connection with c. 23, see the introductory nn. to c. 23 and to this c. Why does God not appoint for Himself set times at which to judge men, measuring out punishment to wrong-doers, and rescuing the wronged from the violence done to them by their fellow-men? Why do not men see (ct. 22^{19}—Eliphaz) God thus judicially active? The questions are wider than in 21^{7}: attention is turned now not only on the wicked, but on their victims.—*Times . . . days*] the parallelism is not favourable to Du.'s substitution for *days* of *day*, *i.e.* the day of Yahweh (eschatological).—*Laid up*] the same vb. as in 15^{20} 21^{19}.—*They who know him*] not specifically those who know of God's future judgment (Du.); but, in general, the righteous; cp. "him that knoweth not God" (|| to the unrighteous, עול) in 18^{21}; cp. also Ps. 36^{11}. Or, possibly, the term here is due to corruption; in what follows the wronged are not depicted under the aspect of those that know God; the connection with what follows would be easier if some such term as the wicked, or the oppressed, were substituted.

2, 3, 9, 4.—The violent and their victims.

2. *Wicked men*] see phil. n.—*Remove land-marks*] the bound-

2 They drive away the ass of the fatherless,
They take the widow's ox for a pledge.
9 They pluck the fatherless from the breast,
And take in pledge ⌜the infant⌝ of the poor.
4 They turn the needy aside from the way,
All together the poor of the earth hide themselves.

5 Behold as wild asses in the wilderness,
They go forth ⌜to⌝ their work, seeking diligently for meat,
The steppe (provideth) ‸ food for the(ir) children.

---

aries between their own land and their neighbours', in order to incorporate their neighbours' land in their own: cp. Dt. 19^{14} 27^{17}, Pr. 23^{10}.—*And feed them*] 𝔊 *with their shepherd*: see phil. n.

3. The most helpless classes are spoiled of their means of livelihood: cp. $22^{6.9}$.

9. The v. is certainly out of place between [8] and [10]: if not a gloss, it may have stood here: see phil. n.—*The infant of the poor*] 𝔐 *over*, or *upon*, *the poor*: but see phil. n.

4. The exact point of [a] has been differently taken: they hinder the poor of their just rights (Da., cp. Am. 5^{12}): they thrust the poor out of the public way, where every one has a right to walk (Di.), or where the sight of them displeases the high-handed wicked (Du.): they violently get rid of the poor when these run after them begging for restoration of what has been plundered from them (Hi.).

5–8. Description of certain miserable starvelings of the steppes, whose search yields them little food and no shelter: cp. 30^{2-8}. Here there is no allusion to the authors of the misery: ct. [1-4] and even [10f.].

5. The text is corrupt and the meaning in detail uncertain (see phil. n.): but probably "wilderness" and "steppe" were originally parallel terms (cp. Is. 40^{3} 41^{19}), both describing not, as part of the fig. (Bu.), the home of the wild ass (6^{5} 11^{12} $39^{5ff.}$), but the country remote from men and cities where this pitiable set of human beings, not naturally adapted to it like the wild

6 The mixed fodder (of cattle) they reap in the field;
And they take away the late-ripe fruit from the vineyard of the rich.
7 They pass the night naked without clothing,
And have no covering in the cold.
8 They are wet with the rain of the mountains,
And for want of shelter they embrace the rock.

10 (Others) go about naked without clothing,
And being an-hungered they carry the sheaves;
11 Between ⌜the⌝ rows (of olive trees) they make oil;
They tread the wine-vats, and suffer thirst.

---

asses (39^{5-8} n.), eke out their existence.—*Food for the children*] children (נערים) as 29^5 (n.); connecting "the steppe" with [b], many read for [c]: *there is no food for the children*, or (Du.), in this case better, *for those shaken* (out of the land).

6. Again the text is uncertain; but the meaning in general seems to be: even if they (stealthily) issue from the steppe into the cultivated land, they only secure poor and scanty food from the fields and vineyards. For details, see phil. nn.—*The mixed fodder*, etc.] cp. 6^5 n. Read, perhaps, *in the night*.—*The late-ripe fruit*] the few grapes left to ripen on the vines: these they pilfer from the vineyards, now less carefully guarded than when the main crop was ripe and ready for picking.—*The rich*] 𝔐, *the wicked*, which has been understood to refer to those who have driven the starvelings into the steppe (Di.), or, assuming that not starvelings but plundering Bedawin are described, to the agriculturalist who has broken covenant with the Bedawin by refusing to pay the covenanted blackmail (Wetzst.).

8. *Rain*] the heavy rain (זרם) of the winter storms: cp. Is. 25^4 30^{30}.—*Embrace*] cp. La. 4^5.

9. See after v.[8].

10, 11. Slaves, or ill-paid, hard-worked, weary labourers (7^2 14^6), not allowed by these masters to still their pangs of hunger and thirst with any grains from the sheaves which all day long they carry, or the juice of the grapes which they tread

12 From out of the city the dying groan,
And the soul of the wounded crieth out for help;
Yet God regardeth not the folly.

13 Those are of them that rebel against the light;
That know not the ways thereof,
Nor abide in the paths thereof.

---

out. The ill-treatment by the masters, violating the spirit of the law of Dt. 25^{4}, is at least suggested: the scene has shifted back from the steppe ($^{5-8}$) to the farms and the vineyards. $^{10a.\,11a}$ are probably out of place or corrupt: $^{10b.\,11b}$ are parallels: see phil. n.

11a. *The*] 𝔐 *their*, paraphrased by "the . . . of these men" in EV.—*Rows*] the meaning *walls* (EV. al.) is unsupported: see phil. n.

12. From the steppe ($^{5-8}$) and the cultivated country side ($^{10f.}$), the description here passes, if the text is correct, to human suffering in the towns; in any case $^{13-17}$ probably contemplate town-life. But in ^{12} there is nothing *distinctive* of town-life: men die everywhere and may be wounded anywhere. Bu. therefore places ^{12} after ^{14b}, as describing the result of the murderer's activity; but this overloads the description of the murderer as compared with those of the adulterer and thief, and "out of the city" would be rather pointless. Others emend (see phil. n.), following 𝔊, which already, with no very different text, expressed quite a different sense: "Out of the city, out of (their) houses they are driven forth, And the soul of the children crieth out for help."—*The city the dying*] 𝔐: the city of men.—**c.** Or, emending, *Yet God heareth not their prayer.* On *folly*, see 1^{22}.

13–17. Three classes of the enemies of light (^{13}) and lovers of darkness ($^{16b.\,c\,17}$): the murderer ($^{14a.\,b}$), the adulterer (^{15}), and the thief ($^{14c.\,16a}$)—violators of the 6th, 7th, and 8th commandments. For the emendation in and the transposition of ^{14c}, see phil. n.

13. *Those*] now to be mentioned—an unusual use of the pron.—*Are of*] are, or have become, among the number of:

14 ⌜Before⌝ the light the murderer riseth,
That he may kill the poor and needy.
15 And the eye of the adulterer waiteth for the twilight,
Saying, No eye shall see me:
And he putteth on a covering for his face.
14c And in the night the thief ⌜goeth about⌝,
16a He diggeth into houses in the dark.

היה ב as in Jg. 11^{35}.—*Them that rebel against the light*] a striking phrase, which in another connection might well be explained as a mythological allusion (Di.); but before $^{14-16}$ the light in question must be daylight, not the good principle. Certainly ^{13} attaches loosely to what precedes: on the other hand it forms a good introduction to $^{14-16}$ with $^{16b.c.\ 17}$ as a corresponding conclusion; it is therefore precarious to omit the v. (Stud. cp. Di.), or to separate it from $^{14ff.}$ (Grill, who retains $^{1.\ 4.\ 10-12.\ 22ff.}$ as the genuine parts of the c.). With ^{b}, ct. ^{17b}.

14. *Before the light*] 𝔐 *at the light*, *i.e.* when it is light, which is inconsistent with the context: together with 𝔐 in ^{14c} it would imply that the same persons murder by day and thieve by night (Del.). With ^{b}, cp. Ps. $10^{8f.}$ and see phil. n. Line ^{c} (placed above after v.^{15}: see phil. n. on ^{16}) in 𝔐 reads, *And by night let him be like a thief!* 𝔐 in ^{a} could only be retained if אור had already developed its later (Mishnic) meaning of *evening*, *night* (see, *e.g.*, *Pes.* 1^{1}: *NHWB*, *s.v.* אור).

15. Cp. Pr. 7^{9}. If ^{c} is in place, the adulterer makes himself doubly secure against detection: he waits till it is dark, and even then covers his face with his mantle, or disguises himself as a woman with a woman's veil (Wetzstein in Del.).

16a describes the activity not of the adulterer (as in 𝔐), but of the thief (see phil. n.) whose practice was to dig through (Ex. 22^{1}, Jer. 2^{34}, Mt. 6^{19}) the clay walls of houses and steal, avoiding, probably from superstitious motives, any attempt to force an entrance by the door (Trumbull, *The Threshold Covenant*, p. 260 f.). That an adulterer should dig a hole through the wall of a house, creating the need for awkward explanations when the husband returned, is very improbable: his mode of ingress would be different (cp. Pr. $7^{7ff.}$) from that of the thief.

16b In the daytime they shut themselves up,
⸢One and all⸣ they know not the light;
17 For midnight is (as) morning to them,
For ⸢they are⸣ acquainted with the terrors of ⸢darkness⸣.

18 "⸢They⸣ are swift" (ye say) "upon the face of the waters.
Their portion is cursed in the earth;
No treader (of grapes) turneth towards ⸢their vineyard⸣.

16b. All these nefarious persons keep at home by day. An alternative (cp. AV. RVm.) but less probable rendering of the line is, *which they had sealed for themselves by day*: *i.e.* they set marks for purposes of recognition on that part of the house by which they intend to gain entrance.—*Shut themselves up*] securely; lit. *seal themselves up*: cp. the use of *seal* in 9^{7} 14^{17} 37^{7}.

17. Night is for them, as for wild beasts (Ps. 104^{20-22}), day, *i.e.* the time of their activity. An alternative rendering of ᵃ is, *For morning is as midnight to them*, *i.e.* they dread morning as much as ordinary people dread darkness.—*Midnight*] lit. thick darkness; 3^{5} n.

18–24. In part at least these corrupt, difficult, ambiguous or unintelligible verses describe the unhappy fate of the wicked; this is a constant theme of the friends, whereas Job admits at most and by way of concession (c. 21) that *some* wicked men meet with an unhappy fate, but only as rare exceptions to the general rule that the wicked prosper. It is necessary, therefore, to suppose either (1) that the vv. are out of place (for some theories, see the introductory note to the c.): or (2) that Job in $^{18-21}$ is citing the opinions of the friends to reject them in v.^{22f}: so RVm.: for other real or assumed examples of such citation, see $21^{16. 19}$. The difficulty is not to be avoided either (1) by translating optatively (let them be swift, etc.: cp. 𝔊𝔖𝔙): for this would have required different forms in 𝔐 (קל יהי for קל הוא and אל יפן for לא יפנה); or (2) by making $^{18-21}$ and $^{22-24}$ illustrations of God's different treatment of the wicked—severe treatment of some, easy treatment of others—without any appearance of moral discrimination (Di.), for of such difference the text says nothing.

19 Drought and heat consume snow waters:
(So doth) Sheol (those who) have sinned.
20 The womb forgetteth him:
The worm doth suck him:
He is remembered no more:
And unrighteousness is broken as a tree.

---

18. *They are*] 𝕳 *he is*—in either case, if ^{a} goes with $^{b.c}$, the wicked generally (cp. $^{19b\ 20d}$) rather than the special classes of $^{13-17}$ are intended: their life is short; they are *swiftly* (9^{25}) gone, like something hurried away by the stream (Hos. 10^{7}). *Portion*] of ground, as in 2 S. $14^{30f.}$, Am. 4^{4}.—*Is cursed*] and in consequence unproductive (cp. Gn. $3^{17f.}$); whether the curse on the wicked man's ground is thought of as pronounced by God (cp. Gn. 8^{21}, the same vb. as here) or man (5^{3}, a different vb.) is uncertain.—**c.** 𝕳 may be translated as above, the meaning being: as his (arable) ground is barren, so his vineyard no longer yields grapes. 𝕸: *he turneth not by the way of the vineyards*, which has been understood as the reverse of "to sit under one's vine and fig-tree" (Da.).

19. In 𝕳 the v. is unrhythmical, awkwardly expressed and no doubt corrupt (see phil. n.); ^{b} (apart from ^{a}) would be more naturally rendered, as it is in 𝕲, *his sin is asked for*. Du., rejecting as glosses ^{19b} and (in ^{18b}) "the way of the vineyards," and treating the remainder as two parallels to ^{18b} (reading יאספנה for לא יפנה, ינזלוה for ינזלו), renders, Drought and heat take it away, Snow waters consume it: *i.e.* lack of rain in summer, excess in winter, alike serve to ruin the wicked man's land.

20a–c. The wicked passes out of all remembrance, even of the mother who bore him (cp. Is. $49^{15f.}$), and only the worm now finds any satisfaction in him. But (see phil. n.) not improbably one or two slight errors in transcription have quite altered the figures of the lines, which rather read:

The square of his (native-) place forgetteth him,
And his name is remembered no more.

20d. Cp. 19^{10}: but the line attaches awkwardly and suspiciously to those that precede, whether these are read as in 𝕳 or as emended (see last n.); nor is the awkwardness less, if

[21] He ⌜ill-treateth⌝ the barren that beareth not:
And doeth not good to the widow."
[22] Yet (God) by his power maketh the mighty to continue:
He riseth up, though he believeth not that he will live.

---

with RVm. the line is connected with [21]: And unrighteousness is broken as a tree: even he that devoureth, etc. Du., assuming extensive corruption and transposition of words, reads: Like a rotten tree he is uprooted (כעץ רעע יעקר).

21. Typical activities of the wicked man (cp. [2. 4. 9]): ill-treatment of the widow is familiar, but we should expect as its parallel ill-treatment of the orphan; instead of this, 𝔐 as rendered above refers strangely to ill-treatment of childless women, the point being supposed to be that such have no sons to defend them (Di.: on some curious earlier explanations, see Schult.), or if it be rendered *he keepeth company with* (Pr. 29[3]) *the barren* (so Marshall), to adultery with wives unlikely to conceive. Du., continuing his textual reconstruction of [20d], reads, [21b] He doeth not good to the widow, [21a] And hath no compassion on her child (עולה—וְעֻלָּהּ לא רחם from [20d], רחם for תלד: רעה עקרה has already been taken back into [20d]).—*Ill-treateth*] 𝔐 *graseth on* (see phil. n.), or *keepeth company with* (see above).

22–24. So far from the wicked suffering an untimely fate, as you say ([18–21]), God prolongs their life ([22a]) beyond their expectation ([22b]) and grants them security ([23a]) and tenderly cares for them ([23b]): such is the point of [22f.], if 𝔐 is retained in [23] and is to be translated as above in [22]; and the same line of thought would be continued in [24], if this really meant that though the wicked share the common fate of men, they do so only when they are like ripe ears of corn (5[26]), *i.e.* after a long life. But the antithesis at the beginning of [22a] is not marked in 𝔐 ("Yet" is merely "and"); and the verses have been understood by some (Du. for instance) as continuing throughout the description of the unhappy fate of the wicked.

22. *Yet (God) . . . maketh . . . . to continue*] in life (see phil. n.): 𝔐 may also be translated, *And he draweth away* (𝔊𝔙 EV), viz. to destruction, the vb. being the same as in Ps.

23 He granteth him to be confident, and he stands supported;
And his eyes are upon ⌜his⌝ ways.
24 They are exalted for a little while, and they are gone;
Yea, they are brought low, they are ⌜plucked off⌝ like ⌜mallows⌝,
And like the tops of ears of corn are they cut off.
25 And if it be not so, now, who will prove me a liar,
And make my speech nothing worth?

22b.—*Riseth up*] from a bed of sickness (cp. Ex. 21^{19}). By itself the line might have a different sense: *though he stand up*, endure (8^{15}) for the moment, *yet he has no confidence in his life* continuing.

23a. Du., If he is pulled down, he has no hope of finding support: see phil. n. on 22.—b. Ps. 33^{18}. For *his eyes*, Du reads *his oppressor* (מענהו); RVm. *but his eyes* understands the line of the punishment of the wicked: though God seems to give them security (a), yet all the time He is narrowly watching them to punish them.

24. Even in 𝕳 this v. most naturally suggests the untimely end of the persons referred to; for the alternative view, that it describes God's favour (see on 22-24 and phil. n.), reference is made to 21^{13}.—*They are brought low*] *i.e.* (if the word is rightly read) in death.—*Plucked off*] 𝕳 *contract themselves*, *i.e.* in death. —*Like mallows*] So 𝕲: 𝕳 *like all* (men).—*Mallows*] 30^{4}.—*Tops of the ears of corn*] this appears to stand for: tops of the *stalks* of corn: corn was reaped by cutting off the tops of the stalk a little below the ear: see *EBi. Agriculture* 67 with illustrations.—*Are cut off*] or *withered*: so Di. who understands the line as referring to the withering of the tops of the *ears* (see last n.) as the corn ripens.

XXV. Bildad's third speech.—This speech, which speaks of the majesty of God (2f.) and, echoing Eliphaz (4^{17} $5^{14ff.}$), of the impossibility of man ranking as pure before God (4-6), opens abruptly, without a question (4^{1} n.), and is of extreme brevity. The brevity has sometimes been regarded as an indication on the poet's part that the arguments of the friends are exhausted; more probably it is due to early mutilation of the text which

XXV. 1 Then answered Bildad the Shuhite, and said,
2 Dominion and fear are with him;
Who maketh peace in his high places.
3 Is there any number of his troops?
And upon whom doth not his light arise?

---

led to the loss or misplacement of the opening (see on 26^{2-4}) and other parts of Bildad's speech: see the Introduction.

2–6. God rules in such a way as to inspire terror (^{2a}), imposing His will on all who resist Him, even among the inhabitants of heaven (^{2b}); in the execution of His will He can rely on innumerable and invincible powers (^{3}). Should man on earth, then, criticize Him, as Job had done (23^{13}–24^{25}), or, again as Job had done ($23^{7.\ 11f.}$), claim to be innocent ($^{4-6}$)? Neither of the terror of God's rule (see $23^{15ff.}$), nor of the imperfection and impurity of human beings (see 9^{2}), did Job need Bildad to instruct him.

2. *With him*] *i.e.* with God (see phil. n. on 24^{22}), who may have been mentioned previously in some part of Bildad's speech now lost: in every other speech the friends begin with some direct address to Job, or indirect reference to him; Du. prefixes 26^{2-4} which contains such an opening, but does not contain an antecedent to *with him.*

2b. Cp. Is. 24^{21} (with n. there) and cc. 9^{13} $26^{12f.}$ (with notes)

3. *Troops . . . light*] not very obvious parallel terms, but possible, if we think of the troops as the "host of heaven." Even so, however, ^{3b} remains rather strange, for *arise* (קום: cp. 11^{17}) is not expressed by the usual word (זרח) for the rising of the sun, and the idea of Mt. 5^{45}, that God graciously causes His sun to shine on all creatures, is obviously out of place here. The idea, if the text is right, is rather that of Heb. 4^{13} (Peake): no-one is concealed from God; no-one can secretly withdraw himself from His dominion. But 𝔊 (see phil. n.), keeping up the fig. of ^{a}, and giving to the verbal idiom a well-established sense, reads *And against whom doth not his ambush rise up* (קום על, cp. Dt. 19^{11}).

4–6. A mere variation of Eliphaz's words in 15^{14-16} (cp. $4^{17ff.}$), insisting on a point admitted by Job in 9^{2}: cp. 14^{4}

[4] How then can man be just beside God?
Or how can he be pure that is born of a woman?
[5] Behold, even the moon hath no brightness,
And the stars are not pure in his sight:
[6] How much less man that is a maggot!
And the son of man, which is a worm!

XXVI. [1] Then Job answered and said,
[2] How hast thou helped him that is without power!
How hast thou saved the arm that hath no strength!

---

4. *Beside God*] *i.e.* "having a righteousness independent of God's"—Dr.

5. *Moon . . . stars*] without mention of the sun, as Ps. $8^{4\,(3)}$: in 15^{15} "his holy ones . . . the heavens": 4^{17} "his servants . . . his angels."

6. *Son of man*] in Job only here, and perhaps 16^{21}.—*Maggot*] or worm of decay and corruption (7^5 17^{14}): the term in [b] also expresses "the idea of extreme abasement (Is. 41^{14}, Ps. 22^6)"—Dr.

XXVI. 2–4. Job, if the words are his, ironically acknowledges the help which he has received from Bildad's speech; such abundant and effective wisdom (cp. $12^{2f.}$) must have God as its ultimate source (^{4b})—as Eliphaz, indeed, had claimed (15^{11}). But the sustained use of the 2nd pers. sing. in the address (see below on v.[2]), and perhaps also the interrogative opening so customary with the friends (4^2 n.), but only once employed by Job (19^2), suggest that the lines may be the misplaced opening of Bildad's third speech. In this case Bildad is taunting Job: By your charges against God you have represented Him as weak and ignorant (cp. 22^{13} Eliphaz); but how have you helped and illumined Him with your wisdom uttered at such length? (^{3b}: cp. 8^2 18^2). Whence have you such wisdom that you venture to instruct even God? To which question Bildad leaves unexpressed the obvious answer: there is no wisdom above the wisdom of God: so Du. explains; but the interpretation is perhaps a little laboured.

2. *Thou*] so $^{b.\,3a.\,b\,4a.\,b}$. There is no other example of such

3 How hast thou counselled him that hath no wisdom,
And plentifully declared sound knowledge!
4 ⌜To⌝ whom hast thou uttered words?
And whose spirit came forth from thee?

---

sustained address by Job to one of the friends alone. Job's general habit is to address all three together in the 2nd pers. pl.; so in reply to Eliphaz, $6^{21-24.\ 26-29}$ $16^{2.\ 4f.}$ 17^{10}; to Bildad, $19^{2f.\ 5f.\ 21f.\ 28f.}$; to Ṣophar, $12^{2f.}$ $13^{2.\ 4-13.\ 17}$ $21^{2.\ 3a\ (b\ 𝔊).\ 5.\ 27.\ 29.\ 34}$. The rare instances of the sing. in address to one of the friends alone are: to Eliphaz 16^{3}, to Ṣophar $12^{7f.}$ (probably not original), 21^{3b} (𝔐, not 𝔊): there is no instance in the previous replies to Bildad. Eliphaz in $15^{9f.}$ (scarcely also in 4^{2}) and Bildad in 8^{9} $18^{2f.}$ speak in the pl. as expressing not their individual, but their common standpoint; at other times Eliphaz ($4^{8.\ 12ff.}$ $5^{3.\ 8}$ $15^{6.\ 17}$) and Ṣophar ($20^{2f.}$), but not Bildad, use the sing. There is nothing in Bildad's brief speech in c. 25, nor in 26^{5-14}, if that be considered the misplaced conclusion to it, to account for this very exceptional use of the 2nd pers. sing. in addressing him.—*Him that is without power*] *i.e.* (if the words are Job's) Job himself, not (Mercerius, Schlottm., Ehrlich) God; but God, if the words are Bildad's.—*The arm*] the seat of strength: cp. 40^{9}, and, *e.g.*, Hos. 7^{15}, Ezk. $30^{24f.}$.

3. *Sound knowledge*] the term תושיה (5^{12} n. and phil. n.) has been previously used by Job, Eliphaz, and Ṣophar, but not Bildad.

4. *To whom*] or, rather, *with whose help*? With God's? This certainly gives the better parallelism to [b]. If we read or render (see phil. n.) *to whom*, the point is: will you really teach me, who have no need of such teaching? (cp. Is. 28^{9}).

4b. You cannot but have spoken by the inspiration of God (and [a] by His help: see phil. n.): so rightly Di. Da. explain. The meaning is not: you have borrowed what you have to say from Eliphaz (Del.), or from me, Job (in cc. 9, 12, Bu.): you are comforting me with words that you have plagiarized! (Bu.).

5–14. The power of God extends to Sheol ($^{5f.}$), and is manifested in the incidents of Creation ($^{(10a)\ 12\ (13)}$) and the recurring marvels of the enduring order of the world ($^{7-9.\ 10b.\ 11\ (?\ 13)}$). In

5 The shades do tremble
Beneath the waters and the inhabitants thereof.

---

the probably mutilated state of the text in cc. 25–27 (see Introduction), it is uncertain whether these vv. originally formed part of a speech of Job, or continued the speech of Bildad, following 25^{3} (Peake), or less probably 25^{6} (Reuss, Du. al.). The same general theme—the might and marvellous works of God—is handled elsewhere by Job (9^{5-13} $12^{(7-10).\,15}$: more distantly parallel is the remainder of 12^{7-25}): but it is also more briefly touched on by Eliphaz ($5^{9f.}$ 22^{12}), Ṣophar (11^{7-9}), and by Bildad ($25^{2f.}$); and it forms a main theme of the speeches of Yahweh. So far, then, $^{5-14}$ might well occur in a speech either of Job or of one of the friends. But the theme is not closely related (ct. c. 9) to the opening of the speech ($^{2-4}$), nor to what purports to be its continuation (after a pause, 27^{1}) in $27^{2ff.}$. It is said, indeed, that Job's object is to show that he can outdo Bildad's brief attempt in $25^{2-3\,(6)}$ (Bu.), or that he stands in no need of instruction (cp. ^{4a}) in the greatness of God (Da.); but neither the one nor the other object is really indicated in the present text; and something has perhaps been lost between ^{4} and ^{5}, if both $^{2-4}$ and $^{5-14}$ originally formed part of Job's speech. The connection is not improved by following 𝔊, which omits $^{5-11.\,14a.\,b}$ (cp. Hatch, *Biblical Greek*, 225): this, too, would leave the treatment of the theme in c. 26 as brief as in c. 25.

5. The text is probably in some disorder (see phil. n.). A mere change in the accentuation gives an—at least formally—better distich:

The shades do tremble beneath,
The waters and the inhabitants thereof.

For *the shades beneath*, cp. "Sheol beneath," Is. 14^{9}; for the "waters," regarded as "under the earth," and therefore a possible parallel term to "the shades beneath," cp. Ex. 20^{4}, Dt. 4^{18} 5^{8}. But the combination of the waters, the shades, and the inhabitants of the waters, *i.e.* the fishes, is strange; and the text may have suffered more seriously. As a *continuation* of 25^{3} (the fear of God secures peace in the heights

of heaven), 26^5 (and causes those in the depths of Sheol to tremble) would be admirable; but the v. is by no means so suitable as the *beginning* of Job's rejoinder to Bildad, as Di.'s attempt to justify it as such shows: "*Not the heavenly beings alone* (*as Bildad has said*), *but*, says Job, *even* the shades in the lowest deeps tremble before him"; if what is here (though not by Di.) italicized had been intended, it would surely have been expressed.—*The shades*] רפאים as in Ps. $88^{11\,(10)}$ (‖ the dead), Pr. 2^{18} (‖ death) 9^{18} (‖ "her guests in the depths of Sheol"), 21^{16}, Is. 14^9 26^{14} (‖ "the dead") ^{19†}: so in Phœn., "No seed among the living under the sun, nor resting-place with the shades" (Tabnith Inscription, l. 8; Cooke, *NSI* 4): "may they have no resting-place with the shades, nor be buried in the grave" (Eshmunʿazar's Inscription: *CIS* 1^8, Cooke, 5)—both passages of about 300 B.C. The term quite clearly denotes the inhabitants of Sheol, who had once lived on earth; and to the author of Is. $14^{9f.}$ it denoted them as the weak and feeble survivals of once lusty beings of flesh and blood. It is unlikely, therefore, that in and by itself it meant or implied *giants* (𝔖𝔗𝔙 ΘΣ'*A* here, Du.: cp. Peake), and, if the context really required such a reference, it would be better to assume that words now lost defined the special "shades" intended as those of the primeval giants (cp. "the shades, all the bell-wethers of earth; all the kings of the nations," Is. 14^9). For etymological speculations, which do not determine the meaning placed on the term by late Hebrew writers, cp. n. on Is. 14^9; *EBi. s.v.* Dead.—*The waters*] of the sea (cp. v.^{10}, Gn. $1^{9f.\,22}$), on the surface of which the earth was regarded as spread out (Ps. 136^6) or built (Ps. 24^2); where there was no dry land spread out or built upon and so concealing those waters, they appear as seas or rivers, or give evidence of their presence by springs welling up from below (Gn. 7^{11}); but even these visible waters were, according to Hebrew mode of speech, "under the earth" (Ex. 20^4, Dt. 4^{18}); what was under the waters was therefore *à fortiori* under the earth.—*The inhabitants*] of the waters must be the fish in them; alike the great monsters of the deep and the smaller fish with which the waters swarm (cp. Gn. $1^{21f.}$, Ps. $8^{9\,(8)}$ 98^7): a special reference to the

6 Sheol is naked before him,
And Abaddon hath no covering:
7 Who stretcheth out the north over empty space,
(And) hangeth the earth upon nothing:

great monsters (cp. Peake) might be more appropriate, but is not in the present text: on the other hand, the strange description of the shades as being under the fishes is not necessarily expressed by the text, but disappears if we place the comma after "beneath"; see above. With "beneath the waters and the inhabitants thereof" might be compared "who spread out the earth and all that came out of it" (Is. 42^{5}); but there, though the zeugma is extreme, the allusion to all that comes out of the earth is entirely suitable to the context.

6. Cp. Pr. 15^{11}, Ps. $139^{7f.}$, Am. $9^{2f.}$. Sheol, stripped, with all covering that could screen it removed, lies exposed to the eye of God and defenceless before Him.—*Abaddon*] a term for Sheol as the place of destruction: so Pr. 15^{11} 27^{20} (coupled with Sheol), c. 28^{22} (coupled with Death), Ps. 58^{12} (‖ the grave), c. 31^{12} †. In Rev. 9^{11} = Ἀπολλύων.

7, 8. Sheol conceals no mystery from God (^{6}); and of what are to men the mysteries of earth $^{7(a).b}$, and sky ^{8}, God is Himself the cause, and, as such, cognizant of them; He hangs the earth with its inconceivable weight on nothing, and keeps it so suspended; He uses the clouds as vast water-skins to hold the rain, and they do not split in spite of the immense weight of the rain-water within them; the Hebrews had no conception of the contents of the clouds being the light vapour of water.—*Stretcheth out*] the vb. (נטה) is that commonly used of stretching out the tent (-coverings over the supporting poles): see, *e.g.*, Gn. 12^{8}, Jer. 10^{20}; hence it is used of stretching out the heavens (9^{8}, Zec. 12^{1}, and frequently in Is. 40–66, *e.g.*, 45^{12}), which were conceived as the coverings of a vast tent (Is. 40^{22}, Ps. 104^{2}). If it is here used of the earth (see next n.), it is so used exceptionally and as a synonym of רקע *beat, spread out*, the vb. used of the earth in Is. 42^{5} 44^{24}, where נטה is used of the heavens (another term used of the earth in parallelism with נטה of the heavens is יסד, Zec. 12^{1}, Is. 51^{13}).—*The north*] this

8 Who bindeth up the waters in his thick clouds,
And the cloud is not rent under them:
9 Who closeth in the face of ⌜his⌝ throne,
Spreading his cloud upon it.

---

might mean (1) the northern and highest region of the heavens: cp. Is. 14[13], though some think that even here "the north" is the northern part of the earth; or (2) the northern part of the earth, as Ps. 89[13], Is. 43[6]. The vb. (see last n.) strongly favours meaning (1) here; and, as against this, it is inconclusive to plead that the dome of sky was thought to be supported by pillars (cp. [11]) at the horizon. Since (see last n.) the sky was certainly conceived as a tent-covering, the question may easily have presented itself: how is this vast tent-covering held up without any *central* tent-pole or poles such as earthly tents require, whether the pavilion of a monarch on campaign, puny though it be by comparison, or the constant home of the nomad: see *EBi.* 4970 f. for illustrations and descriptions of central pole(s). But if the usage of the vb. may be disregarded, and meaning (2) adopted, [7] is entirely concerned with the earth, and [8] with the (clouded) sky.—*Hangeth . . . upon*] i.e. *suspends from* (תלה על as Gn. 40[19], Is. 22[24], Ps. 137[2]), or *suspends over* (as 2 S. 4[12]): the ‖ favours the latter meaning; but the conception then expressed of the earth poised over empty space would be paralleled, if at all, only in 38[6]: moreover, unless we consider the pillars of the earth (9[6]) part of it, constituting, so to speak, its skeleton (Di.), and the waters under it ([5] n.) also part of it, viz. its foundations (*ib.*), the conception would not be strictly compatible with what is implied by these expressions.

8. For the clouds conceived as, or under the figure of, water-skins, see 38[37], Ps. 33[7] 𝔊: for the marvel of rain, Pr. 30[4]; also cc. 36[27f.] 38[34].

9a might also be translated "Who closeth in the face of the full moon," viz. when the moon is eclipsed; but this is less likely, though even the translation above is not free from difficulty; see phil. n. "Jehovah's throne was pictured by the Hebrews as being above the solid firmament of heaven (cp. 37[18], Am. 9[6]): its 'face,' or outside front, was hidden from the

[10] He hath ⌜marked out a circle⌝ upon the face of the waters,
Unto the confines of light and darkness.
[11] The pillars of heaven quiver,
And are astonished at his rebuke.

---

view of men upon the earth, partly by this firmament, partly by the clouds underneath it" (cp. $22^{13.14}$)—Dr.

10. "The ancients supposed the earth to be a flat disk encircled by waters [cp. [5] n.]: and so this v. means that God has" *marked out a circle* "(corresponding to what we call the 'horizon,' though conceived by the Hebrews as a *fixed* boundary) upon the surface of these waters: along their inner edge rise the mountains supporting the great dome of heaven (cp. Am. 9^6); and the 'boundary' thus formed marks the confines of light and darkness, because within this dome the heavenly bodies revolve, while outside all is darkness"—Dr. See, further, Whitehouse's art. COSMOGONY in *DB* with the sketch on p. 503.

11. *The pillars of heaven*] the mountains at the horizon conceived as supporting the vault of heaven: see on v.[10]. En. 18^3 refers to the phrase and wrongly explains it. Even the mountains tremble at the voice, *i.e.* the thunders of God (cp. Ps. 29, $18^{8\,(7)}$).—*Rebuke*] here of God speaking angrily in thunder: cp. Ps. $18^{16\,(15)}$ 104^7 with the parallel and the context.

12 f. There have been two main lines of interpretation of these verses; both vv. have been regarded as instancing either recurrent manifestations of God's power in the phenomena of sea and sky, or mighty acts of God at or before the creation of the world. Some interpret [12] only in the second sense, [13] in the first. The use of the perfect tense in both lines of [12] and in [13b] ([13a] has no vb.), in contrast to the imperfects and participles of recurrent divine action which predominate in [5-11], favours the view that the verses—at least [12]—refer to specific acts at creation, and the correspondence, again most clearly in [12], to conspicuous features of Babylonian mythology increases this probability. If the reference throughout is to recurrent action, present tenses (as in RV.), *is stilled* . . . *smiteth*, should be substituted for the pasts in the above translation; if [13] as well

12 Through his power the sea was stilled;
And by his understanding he smote through Rahab.
13 By his wind the heavens are brightened:
His hand pierceth the fleeing serpent.

---

as [12] refers to an act at creation, the past should be substituted for the present in [13] *were . . . pierced.*

12. The v. is best taken (see last n.) as containing allusions, such as have already occurred in this book (9[13]), to the Hebrew form (in which all creative activity was attributed to Yahweh) of the old Babylonian mythological account of creation: as, in Babylonian story, before the creation of the world, Tiamat, the representative of the sea and disorder, had to be subdued, and as Marduk, in conflict with Tiamat, "seized the spear, and tore her belly, cut her inward parts, pierced her heart, made her powerless, destroyed her life, cast down her body and stood upon it" (*Tablets of Creation*, iv. 101–105: Rogers, *CP*, p. 29), so, in Hebrew popular story, before the creation of the world Yahweh quelled the sea, and, like the wise Marduk of the Babylonian story, who used craft (*ib.* iv. 95–100), not by mere might, but by the use of *his understanding*, slew the sea-monster *Rahab* (see 9[13] n.). The tenses do not favour the view that a fresh piercing of Rahab every time a stormy sea was hushed, is here referred to.—*Was stilled*] others render, *he stirred up* (to fight): see phil. n.—*He smote through Rahab*] cp. Is. 51[9].

13. "The v. describes how, after a storm, the wind,—God's 'breath' (as Is. 40[7]),—clearing away the clouds, brightens the sky; and how the 'fleeing serpent' (cp. Is. 27[1]), which was popularly supposed to be the cause of darkness at an eclipse (cp. 3[8]), is destroyed by His power, and the light of the sun restored"—Dr. On this view of the v., for which see also Di. Da. Del. Peake, the writer returns from illustrating the power of God shown in His mighty acts at creation ([12]) to examples of His recurrent activity in nature (cp. [5–11]); and perhaps [14] more naturally attaches to examples of recurrent activity than of unrepeated acts in the past. Yet the pf. tense in [b], the similarity of [b] to [12b], and of [13b], [12b] combined to Is. 51[9], together establish a strong presumption for referring [13] like [12] to the

[14] Lo, these are but the outskirts of his ways;
And what a whisper of a word do we hear of him!
But the thunder of his mighty acts who can comprehend?

---

past, though perhaps none of the attempts so to explain it have been entirely satisfactory.

𝔙 ("Spiritus eius ornavit caelos, et obstetricante manu eius eductus est coluber tortuosus") and 𝔗 (in which, as in 𝔙 (ct. 𝔖), the vbs. in both lines are, as in 𝔐 in [b], in the pf.) understand the v. to refer to the clearing up of the heavens at creation (cp. Gn. 1[2f.]) and to the creation of Leviathan (cp. 3[8]), which 𝔗 definitely names here. But modern interpreters of the v. appeal for support to the parallelism of [12] with the Babylonian story, which parallelism, it is contended, with considerable probability, continues in [13]; and to 𝔊. 𝔊, though it implies in [a] a Hebrew text very slightly differing from 𝔐, gives [a] a very different sense, viz. *The bars of heaven shuddered before him*: this is adopted by Gunkel (*Schöpfung u. Chaos*, 36 f.), who sees in [a] an allusion to the bars or bolts which were forbidden to let water stream down from heaven, except when God permitted, and shuddered to disobey the divine command. It will be convenient to cite the lines of the Creation story (iv. 130–132, 135, 137–141; Rogers, *CP* 25 ff.) most immediately concerned:

"With his merciless club he broke her (Tiamat's) skull,
He cut through the channels of her blood,
And he made the North wind bear it away to secret places.
Then the lord rested, he gazed upon her dead body,
He split her open like a flat (?) fish into two halves;
One half of her he established as a covering for heaven.
He fixed a bolt, he stationed a watchman,
He commanded them not to let her waters come forth."

But the "bars of heaven shuddered" would be a strange way of alluding to this. We might rather surmise that the allusion to the myth lies not in the *bars* of 𝔊, but the *wind* of 𝔐 (the remainder of [a] being corrupt). For the part played by the wind in the conflict with Tiamat, cp. the third of the lines just cited, and, *e.g.*, iv. 45–48:

He created an evil wind, a tempest, a hurricane,
A fourfold wind, a sevenfold wind, a whirlwind, a wind beyond compare.
He sent forth the winds, which he had created, the seven of them,
To disturb the inner parts of Tiamat, they followed after him.

In the "fleeing serpent" of [b], following Rahab in [12b], Gu. sees evidence that the Hebrew myth spoke of two creatures slain by Yahweh, as the Babylonian myth speaks of Kingu as well as Tiamat. Daiches (*ZA*, 1911, p. 3) finds in [a] a statement of the creation of the heavens, in [b] of the creation of the sea, in agreement (as he argues) with the order of events after the slaying of Tiamat in the Babylonian story; but see phil. n.

14. Marvellous as are the ways of God just described, what is indescribable is immeasurably more marvellous; the story of

XXVII. [1] And Job again took up his discourse, and said,
[2] As God liveth, who hath taken away my right;
And the Almighty, who hath embittered my soul;

His mighty acts comes through to man as a mere whisper of the thunder of their far distant reality. Even what God does is but partially and faintly heard: how much less can the reason for what He does be discovered! such is probably the indirect suggestion of the v.

XXVII. This c. (1) opens with an introductory formula stating that Job is the speaker, although it immediately follows what is, according to 26^1, a speech of Job; (2) is, for the most part of its contents, entirely at variance with the standpoint of Job, and in entire agreement with the standpoint of the friends. Both these features are probably due to dislocations of the text in this part of the book; see on cc. 25, $26^{2-4. 5-14}$ and Introduction. While $^{2-6}$ clearly, ^{12} probably, and perhaps ^{11} belong to a speech of Job's, $^{7-10}$ and $^{13-23}$ are most naturally referred to one of the friends, and perhaps formed parts of the apparently missing third speech of Ṣophar.

1. *Took up his discourse, and said*] So 29^1, Nu. $23^{7. 18}$ $24^{3. 15. 20. 21. 23}$; see n. in *Numbers*, p. 344 f.—*Again*] after c. 26, though no other speaker has intervened (cp. 34^1 35^1 36^1 40^1). If dislocation of the text is not assumed (see above), it is usual to assume that Job pauses for Ṣophar to reply, and finding him silent resumes his own speech.

2–6. Job once again maintains, and now for the first time with a solemn oath (cp. $31^{5ff.}$), his integrity, and that his manner of life in no way accounts for the calamities that have befallen him; that these, on the contrary, prove not his unrighteousness, but God's perversion of his right; and, consequently, that it would be a profane thing for him (^{5}) to admit that his friends had spoken the truth. These verses read quite like the *beginning* of a speech of Job; and do not require, scarcely even allow, 26^{2-4} as an introduction to them. They are not very intimately related to what survives of Bildad's speech, even if 26^{5-14} be referred to him, nor to $27^{7-10. 13-23}$ conjecturally attributed to Ṣophar.

3 (For all my breath is still in me,
And the spirit of God is in my nostrils;)
4 Surely my lips do not speak unrighteousness,
Neither doth my tongue utter deceit.
5 Be it far from me! Surely I will not justify you!
Till I die I will not put away mine integrity from me.
6 My righteousness I hold fast, and will not let it go:
My heart doth not reproach any one of my days.

---

2. Job swears by God, though in the very terms of the oath he charges God with doing him injustice.—*Taken away my right*] 34^{5}: cp. (with הטה for הסיר) Dt. 24^{17} 27^{19}, 1 S. 8^{3}, the milder complaint against God in Is. 40^{27}, and the antithetical phrase in c. 36^{6}.—*Embittered my soul*] cp. "the bitterness of my soul," 7^{11} 10^{1}; "a bitter soul," 21^{25}.

3. The parenthesis "is intended to add strength to Job's protestation: though worn by his disease, he still has life and energy to make it"—Dr. The alternative translation (see phil. n.), *all the while my breath is in me*, would only be suitable (cp. Ps. $146^{2f.}$) if Job were swearing that (^{4}) he would always in the future speak truth: and here he is swearing to the fact that he always has spoken and still does speak truth.

5. *Justify you*] Admit your charges to be true.—*I will not put away my integrity*] the equivalent, stated negatively, of "I will hold fast to my integrity" (cp. $2^{3.9}$). To allow the charges of the friends to pass as true—a course repudiated in ^{4}—would make Job a liar, and so impair his integrity (1^{1} n.).

6. *Heart*] Conscience, as 1 S. $24^{6(5)}$. Never had Job committed such sins as to account for his calamities.

7–10. The speaker—not Job, but possibly Ṣophar (see above)—expresses the wish (ct. 31^{30}) that his enemy may be overtaken by the unhappy lot of the wicked, in particular, that he may—as Job does now ($9^{15f.}$ 13^{24} 19^{7} 30^{20})—find God deaf to him when trouble befalls him ($^{9f.}$). Such an execration would be intelligible in the mouth of the friends who hold the fate of the wicked to be the worst of fates, but not in the mouth of Job; for in his mouth it would mean: May my enemy prosper in life and be honoured in death (cp. *e.g.* $21^{7ff.\ 29-33}$)!

[Ṣophar (?)]

7 Let mine enemy be as the wicked,
And let him that riseth up against me be as the unrighteous.

Two attempts to explain the words as Job's may be referred to. "The words being inconsistent with the condition of Job's mind as revealed in his speeches, it is supposed (*a*) that he has at last found his way to an assured trust in God, or that such a trust has suddenly, after the attacks of his friends are ended, flashed upon him, and filled his mind with the hope of a restoration to God's favour (Ew. Di.). This altered frame of mind, however, though not in itself inadmissible, is difficult to reconcile with what follows: for in $30^{20.\,23}$ Job expresses again the same thought, which *ex hypothesi* he would have overcome; he denies, precisely as he has done throughout the debate, that God listens to his cry. And similarly in 31^{35-37} he treats God *still* as his adversary. At the same time it is conceivable that the author only intended to represent Job as having gained a *temporary* calmness of mind, which afterwards, as the contrast between his past and present condition forces itself upon him (cc. 30–31), he fails to maintain. The alternative (*b*) is to conclude that the implicit reference is to Job's *past* condition, and to suppose that the state of mind which Job denies to the ungodly is suggested by memories of his own former condition, as described in c. 29, when the tokens of God's friendship were abundantly bestowed upon him. Upon this view the words are considered to be introduced here as a *continuation* of vv.$^{2-6}$, as though to say: How could one have ever been tempted to sin, who knew so well the miserable mental state into which the sinner falls? (Hengstenberg partly; Budde [*ZATW*, 1882], pp. 205–210, and in his *Comm.*"—Dr. *LOT*^{9} 422. Bu. in the interests of this interpretation places ^{7} after ^{10}.

7. For the form of speech, cp. Nu. 23^{10}. To wish the best for oneself—the lot of the righteous, and the worst for one's enemy—the lot of the wicked, was, in spite of better teaching (Pr. 24^{17}), doubtless the average moral practice of the day, and this the author might readily attribute to any one of the three representatives of the normal religious dogma: he represents Job as governed by a higher morality ($31^{29f.}$).—*Mine enemy*] obviously quite general—any one who is my enemy, as, *e.g.*, in Ex. 23^{4}. It is only, if the v. is assigned to Job, that artificial interpretation is required to establish a connection with $^{2-6}$: Di., *e.g.*, explains: Let not me, but my enemy, *i.e.* him who denies my righteousness (v.$^{5f.}$), be, *i.e.* appear, as the one who is in the wrong.

8 For what is the hope of the godless, when he ⌜is⌝ cut off,
When God ⌜requireth⌝ his soul?
9 Will God hear his cry,
When trouble cometh upon him?
10 Will he delight himself in the Almighty,
(And) call ⌜unto⌝ God at all times?

[Job]

11 I will teach you concerning the hand of God;
That which is in the mind of the Almighty will I not conceal.
12 Behold all ye yourselves have seen it;
Why then are ye become altogether vain?

---

8. *Is cut off*] cp. Is. 38^{12}. But in this context the expression almost seems to imply that, in contrast to the wicked, the righteous, when he is "cut off," has a hope of immortality. But if so, the clause is inconsistent with the standpoint of the book. See, further, phil. n.—*Requireth*] 𝔐 *draweth out*.

10a. Cp. 22^{26a} (Eliphaz).

11, 12. In [11] (as in [12]) the pron. *you* is pl.; unless this be corrected to the sing. (see phil. n.), [11] as well as [12] must be part of a speech of Job to the friends. Apart from the question of the pron., v.[11] would be equally suitable in the mouth of either Job or one of the friends; each claims to know the *hand*, or action, and the mind of God, in regard to the righteous and the unrighteous. In [12] the 2nd plural (four times) is too deeply embedded in the text for the v. to be anything but a part of Job's address through one to all three of the friends (cp. n. on 26^2); if the pl. in [11] is right, the vv. may have stood together: I will teach you how God treats the righteous and the unrighteous (v.[11]), though, as a matter of fact, you ought not to need to be taught facts of life which stare you in the face ([12a]); yet you do, for ([12b]) your entire conduct of your argument has no relation to reality (see phil. n.). But that such a prelude should, in the mouth of Job, be followed by [13-23], cannot be shown to be probable (see on [13-23]).

13-23. The unhappy fate of the wicked man as described, perhaps by Ṣophar, in any case, not by Job.

[ȘOPHAR (?)]

13 This is the portion of a wicked man ⌈from⌉ God,
And the heritage of oppressors, which they receive from the Almighty.
14 If his children be multiplied, it is for the sword;
And his offspring are not satisfied with bread.

For it would be "remarkable (*a*) that Job should undertake to teach his friends what they had continuously maintained, viz. the evil fate which overtakes the wicked; (*b*) that he should himself affirm the opposite of what had been his previous position, viz. that an evil fate does *not* overtake the wicked (9^{22-24}: c. 21: c. 24); (*c*) that while coinciding with his friends in opinion, he should reproach them with folly" (^{12}). "The solution commonly offered of this difficulty is that Job is here modifying his former extravagant expressions respecting the prosperity of the wicked, and conceding that, *as a rule*, or *often*, a disastrous fate overtakes them. But, as Professor Davidson remarks: (α) the limitation, 'as a rule,' has to be read into the passage, for the language is as absolute as that of any of his friends; (β) if the passage be a retractation of Job's previous language, it is a retractation which errs equally in extravagance on the other side: for it asserts a law of temporal retribution without any apparent qualification whatever; (γ) it is singular that in describing the fate of the wicked at God's hands, Job should use the same figures, and even sometimes the same words, which he employs when speaking of his own destruction by God (^{21}, cp. 9^{17} 30^{20}; ^{22}, cp. 16^{13}; ^{23}, cp. 17^{6} 30^{9-14}). Perhaps, however, this coincidence is accidental. A decidedly better explanation is that of Schlottmann and Budde (*ZATW*, 1882, p. 211 ff.), who suppose the passage to be spoken by Job *with an eye to his three friends*: v.^{11} he ironically declares that he will 'teach' them, which he does by forthwith turning their own weapons against them; they *know* (^{12a}) what the fate of the wicked man is, and yet they strangely do not see that by their wicked insinuations against Job they are invoking it deliberately upon themselves! Job has spoken strongly before of the wrong done to him by his friends ($13^{4. 7. 9}$ $19^{2f.}$ 21^{34}), and has threatened them with Divine vengeance ($13^{10f.}$ 19^{29}); and here, upon this view, he holds up to them, if they will make the application, a more distinct warning" (Dr. *LOT*^{9} 422 f.). This seems to be the only explanation "which, while leaving the text as it is, and retaining the passage for Job, gives it a logical place in his argument. But it must be admitted that this explanation is artificial, and that there is nothing in 27^{13-23} to suggest that it is spoken with a view to Job's friends: on the other hand, $27^{7-10. 13-23}$ would be perfectly suitable in Șophar's mouth, and consistent with what he has maintained before" (c. 20)—Dr. *Job*, p. 77.

13. Cp. 20^{29} (Șophar).

14, 15. The wicked man may have many children and family connections, and so (cp. *e.g.* Ps. 127^{3-5}, and see on 1^{2})

15 Those that survive of him are buried in death,
And ⌜their⌝ widows weep not.
16 Though he heap up silver as the dust,
And prepare raiment as the clay;
17 He may prepare it, but the just putteth it on,
And the innocent divideth the silver.
18 He buildeth his house as the ⌜spider⌝,
And as a booth which the keeper maketh.

---

apparently be an object of God's favour; but he lives to see them come to an untimely end through sword, famine, and pestilence. Cp. 5^{4} (Eliphaz), 18^{19} (Bildad), 20^{10} (Ṣophar); ct. 21^{8} (Job). Ṣophar might insinuate the conclusion that as Job's children had come to an untimely end, Job must be unrighteous; Job would not himself make his cruellest loss prove his dearest conviction, that of his own integrity, false.

15. This v. appears to mean: [a] those belonging to the wicked man who *survive* (cp. 18^{19} phil. n.) the sword and famine of ^{14} perish by the pestilence—*death* having this sense, as in Jer. 15^{2} 18^{21}; these not merely die by the pestilence, but receive no other burial than they receive from it, *i.e.* they lie unburied; and [b] (cp. Ps. 78^{64}) they lack the solemn funeral wailing which their widows would normally have supplied. For the aggravation of death by lack of burial, cp. *e.g.* 2 K. 9^{10}, Jer. 8^{2} 14^{16}; by the lack of the correct ceremonial of death and funeral, Jer. $22^{10.19}$.—*In death*] rather *by death.*—*Their widows*] 𝔐 *his widows*, which, unless it means *the widow of each one of them* (see phil. n.), would implicitly anticipate the death of the wicked man, which is not directly referred to before ^{19}, even if there (see n. there); it would also imply that in his lifetime he was a polygamist.

16, 17. Similarly the wicked man may for a time acquire much money and great possessions—here the man's wardrobe is taken as typical of the latter—but only to part with them; his money and goods pass over to the righteous.

16. For the comparisons, cp. Zec. 9^{3}.

18. Cp. $8^{14f.}$ (Bildad), ct. 21^{9} (Job). The house of the wicked man, however strongly he may build it and however

[19] He lieth down rich, but ⌜doeth so⌝ no ⌜more⌝;
He openeth his eyes, and he is not.

---

permanent he may intend it to be, quickly collapses: it is actually as fragile as a spider's web, and has no longer endurance than that most temporary of human habitations, the booth (Is. 1^8) or shelter made of boards and matting for the use of watchmen in vineyards or gardens during the summer, which readily falls to pieces in the storms of autumn and winter; see the picture of a modern "booth" in *SBOT*, *Isaiah*, p. 162.—*Spider*] cp. 8^{14}; this rather than *moth* (עשׁ) is to be read.

19. A day comes when the wicked man goes to bed rich for the last time; next morning he wakes up to find himself dead (cp. Is. 37^{36}), or, translating in ᵇ *and it* (viz. his wealth) *is not*, shorn of his riches. Dr., in the above translation and in the phil. n., with Ew. Di. Da. Del. al., refers this v. to the *death* of the wicked man. But (1) in ²⁰⁻²³ the wicked man is depicted as still alive to experience the bitterness of his fallen fortunes; (2) to continue rich to the last hour of life is rather the privilege (from the standpoint of the current theory of the lot of the righteous and the unrighteous) of the righteous than the fate of the wicked; it is Job's complaint (21^{13}) that, against the current theory, the facts of life show the wicked spending their days in prosperity, and then, when they must share the lot of all mankind, going down easily and in a moment to Sheol. For these reasons we may preferably, with, *e.g.*, Hi. Bu., treat the v. as referring to the sudden loss of the wicked man's wealth.—*But doeth so no more*] or, *but does not again* (*sc.* lie down rich); 𝔐 *and is not gathered*, *i.e.* to the grave in burial.—*He openeth his eyes, and he is not*] if this line refers to death (but see above), cp. 2 K. 19^{35} "when they rose up early in the morning, behold dead corpses were they all."

20-23. The last scene; but even here the death of the wicked man is not depicted; death, which comes even to good men, is too good for him; he is depicted as flooded by waters or hurled by the tempest out of his house where he had once seemed to himself so rich and secure, the mark of God's arrows, hurled unsparingly at him, and the object of man's

20 Terrors overtake him like waters;
In the night a whirlwind stealeth him away.
21 The sirocco carrieth him away, and he departeth;
And it sweepeth him out of his place.
22 And (God) hurleth at him, and spareth not;
He fleeth away from (before) his hand.
23 Men clap their hands at him,
And hiss at him from his place.

---

merciless contempt and scorn—a terror-stricken fugitive from God and man.

20a. Cp. (implicitly) 20^{28} (Ṣophar), 22^{11} (Eliphaz).—*Terrors*] בלהות: $18^{11.14}$ (Bildad), 24^{17} 30^{15} (Job).—*Whirlwind*] 21^{18} 37^{9}.

21. *Sirocco*] 15^{2} 38^{24}; cp. 1^{19} n.

22. God, unnamed in 𝔐, as in 3^{20} (n.), is the subject. The object, too, of *hurleth* must be understood; the arrows of God, *i.e.* the lightnings, are probably intended (cp. 16^{13}). This is the one v. in the entire description in which God, though even here unnamed, is referred to; partly on this ground, partly on the ground that ^{21} comes haltingly after ^{20}, and ^{22} in its present position is very much "post festum," Bu. omits $^{21f.}$ but retains ^{23} as against 𝔊, which omits $^{21-23}$ (so Bi.). See, further, phil. n.

23. Cp. 22^{19} (Eliphaz).—*Clap their hands*] in malicious delight: cp. La. 2^{15}, where also *hiss* (cp. Zeph. 2^{15}, Jer. 49^{17}) occurs in the parallel, and with a different vb., Nah. 3^{19}.

XXVIII. The c. is an independent poem [1] on the limitations of human achievement and, in contrast, the incomparable and inscrutable wisdom of God, rather than a speech either of Job,

[1] The main argument, that c. 28 was not originally part of the Dialogue, is exegetical; but it may also be noted (1) that the c. avoids the divine names regularly used in the Dialogue; in ^{28} אדני, occurring nowhere else in the book, or יהוה, occurring nowhere else in the Dialogue (for 12^{9} is no real exception), is used, and in ^{23} אלהים, which occurs at most twice (5^{8} 20^{29}) in the Dialogue (as against 90 occurrences in all of אלוה, אל, and שדי): see table in the Introduction; (2) though the occurrence of unique words or meanings in the description of mining and precious stones—subjects not handled elsewhere—has little significance, the occurrence of עזוז ^{8}, סלה ^{16}, משך ^{18}, which might have been but are not used elsewhere in the book, is noticeable; (3) the use of a refrain ($^{11.20}$), is more natural to an independent poem than to a speech in the Dialogue.

or, though this would raise less difficulty, of one of his friends, whether Ṣophar (Grätz, *Monatsschrift*, 1872, pp. 241–250; Hoffm.) or Bildad (Stuhlm.). It contains no single *obvious* connection with the stage of the debate now reached, and only in [28], which may refer obliquely to 1^1, has it any connection whatever with any preceding part of the book. On the other hand, in the mouth of Job it *anticipates*, and that in such a way as to render nugatory, the speech(es) of Yahweh in cc. 38–40. What Yahweh there says, using the very words of [26] in 38^{25b} and, as in [25–27] here, illustrating the divine wisdom by reference to certain marvels of creation, is unmistakably addressed to Job with the purpose of bringing him to realize that he does not possess the wisdom of God: consequently what Yahweh there teaches him he would himself here already expound, and that as calmly as if it were a position long reached by himself and generally recognized; for c. 28 is not an argument, but a meditation; it does not attempt to *prove* to the friends or any one else that God's wisdom is unattainable: it *assumes and reflects upon* the truth and its corollary, the limitations of human knowledge: this at least is true of the c. down to [28]: only in the last v. does the poem take on a didactic character, and that v. is probably a later addition (see below).

The nature of the attempts to explain the c. as a speech of Job's, and Dr.'s attitude towards them, are indicated in the following citation from *LOT*[8] 423 f. "It might, no doubt, be supposed that Job, no longer irritated by the retorts of his friends, has reached a calmer mood; and abandoning the attempt to discover a *speculative* solution of the perplexities which distress him, finds man's wisdom to consist in the *practical* fulfilment of the duties of life. But a serious difficulty arises in connection with what follows. If Job has risen to this tranquil temper, how comes it that he falls back (30^{20-23}) into complainings, and dissatisfaction at not having been justified by God (31^{35})? And, further, if he has reached by the unaided force of his own meditations this devout and submissive frame of mind, how is the ironical tone of the Divine speeches (c. 38 ff.) to be accounted for? If he is already resigned to the inscrutability of the Divine ways, how does it need again to be pointed out to him? The difficulty is analogous to that arising out of 27^{7-9}: the changed frame of mind, which both appear to imply, is not preserved in the subsequent parts of the book. It is hardly possible that such a noble and characteristic passage can have been inserted into the poem by a later hand. May it be supposed, as was suggested above, on 27^{7-10}, that Job's tranquil state of mind was conceived by the author as temporary only? It must, however, be allowed that

there is an imperfect psychological basis even for a temporary recovery of calmness: Job is unmoved by all the arguments of the friends; and no other independent influence (as in cc. 38–39) has been brought to bear upon him. . . . According to Budde, Job's intellectual inability to reconcile his sufferings with his innocence having reached its climax in c. 27, he gives up the problem, explaining his incapacity from the fact that wisdom is reserved by God for Himself: what He has given to man under this name is a practical substitute for wisdom, not wisdom itself. Job, upon this view, accepts the ordinance of Providence, though not in a spirit of resignation, but in dissatisfaction and despair. This explanation brings the chapter into consistency with the context; but it is open to the grave objection that (as Davidson, p. 201, already remarked) no trace of such a state of mind is discernible in the entire chapter: on the contrary, the writer seems to be stating, with an eloquence and warmth which cannot be misunderstood, the conclusions which satisfy himself. Cp. Di.^{2} p. 238, who, however, owns that the chapter so understood cannot state the ground (v.^{1} 'for') of what has immediately preceded, and is consequently obliged to assume that something different stood originally in the place of what is now 27^{11-23} (p. 234). For another explanation of the *for*, see Peake, 245 f., or *Enc. Bi.* 2482."

The argument of the poem is: $^{1-11}$ Man by his marvellous inventions can discover the secret of the earth's mineral wealth; the hidden treasure of darkness, which bird and beast cannot find ($^{7f.}$), his eye discovers, and he brings forth to the light for his use; $^{12-19}$ but where wisdom is, he cannot discover, being as helpless in this quest as birds and beasts, nor with the most precious things which he has won from the earth, can he purchase it; $^{20-27}$ for wisdom has no home, or secret lodging, on earth; it is known to God alone, who discovered it long ago, and by it made the world with all its marvels. ^{28} God does not part with this wisdom to man (for man's work is other than God's and needs it not), but commends to him as his wisdom to fear God and avoid evil—in other words, to take Job as his example (cp. 1^1). There is in the last v. a play on two different conceptions of wisdom; wisdom is generally in Hebrew literature practical wisdom, and this wisdom, of which the greater part of Pr. 1–7 may be taken as an exposition, is that referred to in ^{28} as attainable by man and commended to him by God; but the wisdom with which the greater part of this chapter is concerned is "the knowledge of the principles by which both the phenomena of the physical world (cp. Pr. $3^{19f.}$) and the events of human life are regulated" (Dr.)—a concep-

tion of wisdom which to Du. proves that "the author was as certainly acquainted with Greek ideas as Aristobulus and Philo, and may have lived in about the 3rd cent."

Apart from the question already considered, whether this c. or any part of it can have formed an original part of the book, questions have arisen as to the original arrangement and extent of the poem itself: is it complete, or have parts of it been lost? has it been expanded by the incorporation of inconsistent matter? have any of the verses become disarranged? The question of completeness is raised in part by the initial particle, in part by the unexpressed subject of [1-11]. "Surely" (v.[1]) is a doubtful rendering of כִּי: if the particle has its usual meaning, *for* or *because*, something obviously must have preceded it; this may have been a strophe introducing the subject of man's attainments and expressly naming man. Du. suggests that the case is met by assuming that an initial refrain, found now ([12. 20]) only at the beginning of what he regards as the last two of the four equal strophes into which the poem was divided, stood originally also before [1] and [7]; this is at first sight attractive, though the resulting second strophe has been well criticized by Peake (on [7f.]). The poem then opens with the question: where is wisdom to be found, for [1], since silver and gold have their place and can be discovered, so also should wisdom. But this does not overcome the difficulty of the unexpressed subject in [1-11], nor does full justice to the thought. Man is unquestionably the subject of [9a. 10b], and, in the light of this, other vbs., even if they were originally passive in form, must be understood; consequently the thought is not merely: silver and gold and the rest can be found, wisdom cannot; but: silver and gold and other secret and precious things, however hard to discover and acquire, can be discovered *by man*; indeed the thought of *man's* fruitful activity and attainments is most naturally taken to be the dominant thought of [1-11]; and this finds a far more vigorous expression, if it was not introduced by a question suggesting man's limitations. First the poet brings into the highest relief the powers of man, and only then passes on with [11ff.] to the limitation of human attainments. The most important question of expansion is connected with [28] and is discussed on that v.: a more extensive interpolation in the middle of the chapter has been claimed by Di. Bi. Hatch, Bu., though they are not all in agreement as to its exact extent. Hatch (*Biblical Greek*, 225) follows 𝔊 in omitting [14-19]: "the sequence of ideas is not in any way disturbed by the omission of the section [14-19] which amplify the main thought of the passage with singular poetical beauty, but do not add to its substance." Bu. omits [15-20] (*i.e.* both less and more than 𝔊) because they separate the similar vv.[14. 21f.], are poetically feeble (ct. Hatch), and, in asking what is the price of wisdom, presuppose its discoverability and are therefore inconsistent with [12-14]. But it is rather a question of taste whether the idea of vv.[14. 21f.] is best emphasized by being exhausted in consecutive verses or by recurrence to it, and the logical objection to [15-20] would be inconclusive, even if it were as pointed as is suggested. As a matter of fact, the verses do not ask what is the price of wisdom, but say that at no possible price can man acquire it, and this is in entire sympathy with what has been already claimed to be the dominant

[1] Surely there is a mine for silver,
And a place for gold which they wash out.

---

note of $^{1-11}$; in spite of all his attainments and acquired wealth, man cannot at any price obtain wisdom. Bu. also omits $^{8f.}$, and, perhaps rightly, ^{24} (see below). On the possible transpositions of lines in $^{10f.}$, see below: two transpositions more related to the general thought of the c. may be mentioned here: Du. places ^{24}, as applicable to man, after ^{11}, considering that in its present position it suggests as against the thought of the c. that wisdom is to be found on earth. Peake places $^{7f.}$ after ^{12}; but the contrast secured by their present position between man's superiority in knowledge to all other living things, and his inferiority to God is effective.

1. By driving in shafts men obtain silver and gold ore from the dark (cp. ^{3}) secret interior of the earth, and then, at the surface of the mine, after crushing the ore, they wash the pure and precious metal free from the other components of the ore.—*Surely*] or, rather, *for*; see above and phil. n.—*Mine*] Palestine is poor in minerals, and mining, unlike agriculture, enriched the speech and literature of Israel with no figures or metaphors. The only other reference to mining in the OT. is Dt. 8^{9}, where Canaan is described as "a land whose stones are iron, and out of whose hills thou mayest dig copper"; the first of these clauses does not necessarily refer to iron *mines*, but the second clearly refers to copper mines (see Dr. *ad loc.*). In part, at least, the poet is almost certainly referring to mines *outside* Palestine, which he may himself have seen when travelling, or heard of from others. Thus he may have had in mind the mines of Lebanon (iron: Seetzen, *Reisen*, i. 188–190); Idumæa (copper and "formerly" gold: Jer. in Lagarde, *Onom.* 109^{4-8}); Midian (gold: Burton, *Midian Revisited*, i. 329); Upper Egypt (gold: Erman, *Ancient Egypt*, 463); Lycaonia (silver: *EBi.* *s.v.* SILVER), and possibly even silver and gold mines of Spain, which were known to the Jews at least as early as the 1st or 2nd cent. B.C. (1 Mac. 8^{3}); but whether the copper mines of the Sinaitic peninsula, frequently referred to in ancient Egyptian inscriptions (Breasted, as cited below), were still being worked as late as the age of this poem is doubtful (Di.): see, further, Di. *EBi. DB*, *s.v.* MINES; and the reference under Mines to Egyptian sources in Breasted, *Ancient Records*, v. 144.—*Wash out*] as the use of the same vb. in 36^{27} shows, the separating

[2] Iron is taken out of the earth,
And stone is melted into bronze.

---

process referred to here and in Mal. 3[3] (RV. "purge"), Ps. 12[7 (6)] (RV. "purify"), 1 Ch. 28[18] 29[4] (RV. "refined"), is not by fire, but by water. In the second, no less than in the first line of the distich, the reference is to the skill of man in and about the mine. The brutal treatment of man by man in this work is not referred to (ct. 24[10f.]). The following description, based on modern observation of ancient workings in Nubia, and the description given by Diodorus Siculus (iii. 11 ff.), may serve as an illustration of what may have been known to the poet by observation or report.

At Eshuranib in Nubia, the plan of the workings of ancient gold mines is plainly to be seen. "Deep shafts lead into the mountain, two cisterns collect the water of the winter's rain, and sloping stone tables stand by them to serve for the gold-washing. . . . Diodorus describes to us the procedure followed in the working of these mines, and his account is confirmed by modern discoveries. The shafts follow the veins of quartz, for this reason winding their way deeply into the heart of the mountain. The hard stone was first made brittle by the action of fire, then hoed out with iron picks. The men who did this hard work toiled by the light of little lamps, and were accompanied by children, who carried away the bits of stones as they were hewn out. This quartz was then crushed in stone mortars into pieces about the size of lentils; women and old men then pounded it to dust in mills; this dust was next washed on sloping tables, until the water had carried off all the lighter particles of stone; the finer sparkling particles of gold were then collected."—Erman, *Life in Ancient Egypt*, 463 f.

2. As in [1], [b] refers to the separation of the metal from the ore, [a] probably to the extraction of the ore from the mine. *Iron is taken . . . and stone is melted*] the first vb. can be equally well, and the second is better, pointed as active (see phil. n.): this would be in agreement with the following verses, and more forcible: render, therefore, (man) *takes iron . . . and melts stone.*—*The earth*] Heb. the *dust* (עפר): cp. "holes of the dust" (*i.e.* caves) in 30[6]; the shaft of the mine is a great artificial "hole of the dust."—*Bronze*] or *copper*, not *brass*: see *Numbers*, p. 278.—*Stone*] *ore*: cp. Dt. 8[9].

3. Even the darkness of the interior of the earth cannot hide its treasures, and so withhold them from man: if, as is commonly supposed, the writer is thinking of the darkness of

3 (Man) setteth an end to darkness,
And searcheth out to every limit
The stones of thick darkness and black gloom.
4 He breaketh open a shaft away from them that sojourn ⌜in the light⌝;
They that are forgotten by the foot (that passeth by);
That hang afar from men, that swing to and fro.
5 As for the earth, out of it cometh bread,
Yet underneath it is turned up as it were by fire.
6 The stones thereof are the place of sapphires,
And it hath dust of gold.

---

the mine as dispelled by the daylight let in by the shaft, or, by the light of the miner's lamp, he scarcely knew by personal experience the feeble glimmer of daylight that reaches down a mine shaft, or the darkness made visible by the miner's lamp. But perhaps he wrote something more nearly resembling Du.'s emendation: Man has sought out the darkness to its furthest bound, He has searched out the stones of the deepest darkness: see phil. n.

4. Another verse obscure in detail: probably it refers to man's skill in driving shafts into the earth, possibly also to his audacity in descending into the mine in cages that tremble on the rope. RV. is not a translation of 𝔐; against RVm. (= AV.), if it refers to the flooding of a mine, and for various attempts to remove or elucidate the obscure details, see phil. n.

5. Overhead, the peaceful operations of agriculture yielding bread (cp. Ps. 104[14]): underneath, confusion and disorder—like that caused by fire, or (𝔊) actually caused by fire, *i.e.* blasting —due to man's restless energy in digging in the bowels of the earth for its hidden treasure.

6. Not only metals, but precious stones reward man's search into the earth. The v. is closely connected with [1f.], and might have been expected to follow there; Bu. omits [5f.] as breaking the connection between [4] and [7].—*Sapphires*] *lapis lazuli*: see phil. n.—*It*] the pron. is ambiguous, and might refer either to the place, to the sapphire, or (AVm.) to the mine: see phil. n., where Dr. decides in favour of the second possibility: the lapis lazuli has in it particles of iron pyrites

7 The path (thither) no bird of prey knoweth.
Neither hath the falcon's eye seen it:
8 The proud beasts have not trodden it,
Nor hath the fierce lion passed thereby.
9 Upon the flinty rock he putteth forth his hand,
Mountains from the root he overturneth.
10 Among the rocks he cutteth out passages;
And every precious thing his eye seeth.
11 He bindeth up the streams that they trickle not;
And the thing that is hid bringeth he forth to light.

---

which have the hue and colour of gold. A slight emendation gives: and its dust is gold to him (the miner).

7, 8. The path to earth's secret treasures has been won by man only, not by birds with all their keenness of sight (cp. 39[29]), nor by the great and powerful beasts of prey. This, which must be the meaning of the verses if they are in their right position, seems ridiculous to Du., and unsuitable to Peake (see above). Even if, with Peake, we transfer the verses to follow [12], the mining operations are not described without interruption: between [4] and [9] would still stand [6] with its return to the description of the contents of the mine.—*Falcon*] a keen-sighted, unclean (Lv. 11[14], Dt. 14[13†]) bird: not certainly identified.

9-11. Resumption of the description, begun in [3, 4], of the operations of the miner, given as illustrations of man's persistence through difficulties, however great, to his end—the acquisition of treasure.

9. Neither [a] the hardness, nor [b] the mass of the rock, in which the treasure is concealed, can stay man.

10, 11. The lines of the two verses have perhaps suffered transposition (so Du.): [10a. 11a] are parallels, and so also are [10b. 11b]; [10b. 11b], if taken together after [10a. 11a], form a very forcible conclusion (more forcible without, than (Du.) with, [24] added to them) to the description of man's attainments, and a striking preparation for the next paragraph: man discovers and brings to light everything hidden in the earth, but wisdom he cannot find.

10a, 11a. The miner defends himself against the dangers of a flooded mine by staying the water at its source ([11a]), and,

12 But where can wisdom be found?
And where is the place of understanding?
13 Man knoweth not the ⌜way⌝ to it;
Neither is it found in the land of the living.
14 The deep saith, It is not in me:
And the sea saith, It is not with me.
15 Sterling gold cannot be given for it;
Neither can silver be weighed as the price of it.
16 It cannot be valued with the gold of Ophir,
With the precious onyx or the sapphire.

---

perhaps (^{10a}), by cutting channels *in* the mine to carry off the water harmlessly; most, however, understand ^{10a} to refer once again to the passages *into* the mine. See, further, phil. n.

12-19. In spite of all his discoveries ($^{1-11}$), wisdom lies, and always will lie, beyond man's ken ($^{12.\,14}$), or his power to buy ($^{15-19}$).

12. *Understanding*] בינה ‖ to חכמה as in Pr. 9^{10}; cp. תבונה ‖ to חכמה in 12^{12}, Pr. 3^{13} 8^{1}—in all these of wisdom in, or accessible to, man.

13. *Way to*] so 𝔊: cp. ^{b} and ^{23}. 𝔐 *price of*: see phil. n.—*In the land of the living*] *i.e.* on earth, man's place during life, in contrast to Sheol (to which ^{22} refers), whither he descends at death: cp. Ps. 27^{13} 52^{7}, Is. 38^{11} etc.

14. As men traverse the sea they may see marvels (Ps. $107^{23f.}$), but get no tidings of wisdom: its home is not in the sea.

15-19. Cp. Pr. $3^{14f.}$ $8^{10.\,11}$: there the wisdom that man may find is similarly, though more briefly, described, in order to give a due appreciation of the treasure which man may have without buying; here the wisdom that cannot be found is thus described in order to show how impossible it is to acquire it at any price.

16. *The gold of Ophir*] the most highly prized gold: cp. 22^{24}.—*Onyx*] Heb. *shoham*, a highly prized (cp. Ezk. 28^{13}) gem, found in the gold-producing land of Ḥawilah (Gn. $2^{11f.}$); it was used for engraving (Ex. 28^{9}), and was one of the gems used for the "breastplate" (Ex. 28^{20}) and ephod (Ex. 25^{7}) of the high-priest; but whether it was the onyx (𝔊 here: 𝔙 generally), or the beryl (𝔖𝔗 regularly; 𝔊 in Ex. 28^{20}), or malachite (Myers in *EBi.* 4808) is uncertain; see, further, *Lex. EBi. DB*, *s.v.*;

17 Gold and glass cannot equal it;
Neither can the exchange thereof be jewels of fine gold.
18 No mention can be made of coral or crystal;
And the acquisition of wisdom is above that of pearls.
19 The topaz of Ethiopia doth not equal it;
Neither can it be valued with pure gold.

---

also *EBi. Stones* (*precious*).—*Sapphire*] or strictly *lapis lazuli*, as v.[6].

17. Glass (see Smith's or Hastings' *DB* and *EBi. s.v.*), being highly prized in antiquity, suitably appears here; cp., for the same combination of gold and glass, Aristophanes, *Ach.* 73 f. *ἐπίνομεν ἐξ ὑαλίνων ἐκπωμάτων καὶ χρυσίδων*.—*Jewels of fine gold*] articles, especially perhaps the costliest ornaments, wrought in fine gold: with the phrase (כלי פז), cp. כלי זהב (EV. "jewels of gold"), Gn. 24[53], Ex. 3[22] 35[22], Nu. 31[50].

18. *Coral*] ראמות, Ezk. 27[16] and ? Pr. 24[7]. Again the exact gem or precious substance intended is uncertain (see *Lex. EBi. DB*): Di. infers from the difference in the verbal expressions in [a] and [b] that the objects mentioned in [a] are less costly than those in [b]. On *crystal*, see phil. n.—*Acquisition*] see phil. n. Yahuda (*JQR* xv. 704), taking Heb. *meshek* = Arab. *masak* (see phil. n. on 38[31]), proposes: an armlet of wisdom (cp. Pr. 1[9] 3[22] 6[21]) is more precious than one of pearls; but this does not accord well with the thought that wisdom is unobtainable.—*Pearls*] EV. *rubies*. The Heb. פנינים occurs several times in comparison as the pre-eminently costly gem (Pr. 3[15] 8[11] 20[15] 31[10], Sir. 7[19] 30[15]). La. 4[7] apparently suggests that these gems were red (whence G–B. al. *corals*): in spite of this, Bochart, *Hierozoicon*, part ii. bk. v. cc. vi. vii., argued at length in favour of pearls, the meaning adopted, among others, by Del.[2] Di. Dr. "Rubies is the least probable rend. of the Heb. word; and pearls on the whole the most probable" —Dr.

19. There is a repetition in [a] of the vb. of [17a], and in [b] of both the vb. and the subject (gold) of [16a]—the only cases of repetition in [15-19]. Du.'s suggestion is probable, that [19a] is a variant of [17a] and [19b] of [16a].—*Topaz*] Ex. 28[17] 39[10], Ezk. 28[13†]: 𝔙𝔊 topaz. "As the modern topaz was hardly known before

20 Whence then cometh wisdom?
And where is the place of understanding?
21 Seeing it is hid from the eyes of all living,
And kept close from the fowls of the air.
22 Abaddon and Death say,
(Only) with our ears have we heard the rumour of it.
23 God understandeth the way to it,
And *he* knoweth the place thereof;
24 For *he* looketh to the ends of the earth,
And seeth under the whole heaven:

Greek times, and is indistinguishable, except by its superior hardness, from 'false topaz' or yellow rock-crystal, it is possible that the latter is meant" (Myers in *EBi.* 4503 f.).

20–27. Wisdom, unknown to and unattainable by man $^{12-19}$, unseen and, at best, known only by rumour on earth and in Sheol, nevertheless has its place, and from before creation all its secrets have been completely known to God.

21 f. Resumptive of $^{14f.}$. Sheol has knowledge, which it can impart to the living; but it has no knowledge of wisdom, which, in death as in life, man will for ever fail to find.

21. *All living*] Certainly includes and sometimes refers exclusively or at least mainly to men (12^{10} 30^{23}, Ps. 143^{2} 145^{16}): the line is thus substantially a repetition of ^{13b}. If a fresh point and a better parallel to ^{b} seem necessary, כל חיה, *every beast*, must be read for כל־חי, *all living* (Be.^{K}); in this case the point is: no living creature other than man has knowledge of wisdom, though bird and beast at times have knowledge that man has not (cp. the Serpent of Genesis and Balaam's ass). If 𝔐 is right, birds in ^{b} are singled out from "all living" in ^{a} for special reference, as those that fly heavenwards, or as representing the air as a fourth region to earth ^{13}, sea ^{14}, Sheol ^{22}.

22. *Abaddon* and *Death*, as 26^{6} (n.).

23. God, unlike man ^{13}, knows the way to wisdom. The mode of expression is dictated by the antithesis, and is the easier for one who, like the author of Pr. 8, hypostatizes the divine wisdom.

24. Deleted by Bu.; transferred to follow ^{11}, when it would refer to man, by Du.: see phil. n.

25 ⌜When⌝ he made a weight for the wind,
    And regulated the waters by measure;
26 When he made a decree for the rain,
    And a way for the flashes of the thunder;
27 Then did he see it, and recount it,
    He set it up, yea, and explored it.

25–27. Wisdom was before the creation of the world (Pr. 8[22ff.]). Creation is indicated by reference to four of its marvels. The incomparable intelligence or wisdom of God is handled somewhat differently but with some of the same illustrations and phrases in 38[4ff.], Is. 40[12ff.].

25. At creation God assigned to the wind its weight—a maximum of force or weight when it blew which it might not exceed; and marked out with a measure the extreme limit to which the sea might overflow the land.—*When he made*] לעשות *making* or *to make*, connecting with [24]: see phil. n.

26a. Cp. 38[25a]; [b] is identical in both vv., but [a] is there more strictly parallel to [b]; the *decree* (cp. Pr. 8[29]) here corresponds to the measure and weight of [25]; God determined at creation the laws of rainfall "when, where, how heavily" (Di.) it should fall.

27. Again hypostatization of wisdom is as clear here as in Pr. 8; but the precise meaning of some of the vbs. is difficult to seize. Dr. (*Book of Job*, p. 81): "Wisdom is regarded here as a concrete object, or, as we should say, an idea of wonderful complexity, which, at the Creation (v.[26]), God 'saw,' 'recounted,' or surveyed in all its various parts, 'established,' or set up, as though it were a model, 'searched out,' or thoroughly explored, and finally realized in the universe of created things." Similarly Du.: He set it up as a model for the work He had to do, and made proof of it in creation; first was the λόγος, the *νοῦς ποιητικός*, then the execution (of the idea). Yet it is difficult not to feel sympathy with Da.'s criticism of similar earlier explanations: "It is . . . contrary to the poet's vivid conception of Wisdom, as a real thing or being, to suppose that it was 'established' when embodied in the stable, permanent order of created things, as if, being merely an idea before, with wavering outlines, it then became fixed. Neither can the meaning be that God 'set

28 And he said unto man,
Behold, the fear of the Lord, that is wisdom;
And to depart from evil is understanding.

---

up' wisdom before Him merely as an object of contemplation: much less that He set it up as a 'model' after which to work in creating the world." Da. would give to the third vb. (הכינה), which he renders "established" (as RV. *e.g.* in Pr. 8^{27}), the meaning ***gave it existence*** (cp., with a different vb., Pr. 8^{22}); but this idea would be expressed too late by the third vb., if the four vbs. express a succession of activities: the vb. at the beginning of the second line of the distich might, of course, be simply parallel in sense to and express the same activity as the first vb.; but if this were so, הבינה, *he closely observed it*, would be a more probable parallel than הכינה to ראה, *he saw it*, in [a]. For *recount*, *explore*, see phil. n.

28. Up to this point the c. has insisted without any qualification that wisdom is the exclusive possession of God, has no place on earth, and is not imparted to men (ct. 11^{6} Ṣophar). In this, it differs strikingly from Pr. 8, where the real wisdom that was possessed and used by God in the creation of the world presents itself as discoverable also by man. As against the previous part of this c., [28] agrees with Pr. 8 that wisdom may be found by men, although it differs in defining the wisdom that may become man's in terms inconsistent with its being also a possession of God: wisdom is here identified with the fear of the Lord and the avoidance of evil. There is thus, at least superficially, a gulf between the thought of [1-27] and of [28], and the only way to bridge it is to say that the author contemplates two different wisdoms: wisdom in God here conceived intellectually as including the understanding of the laws of the universe, unattainable by man, who must consequently remain without understanding of the universe, and wisdom in man, an ethical quality. God is thus represented here as saying to man: My wisdom cannot be yours, but your wisdom will be to fear Me: you cannot understand the universe which I have made, but you can fear Me like Job (1^{1}), and avoid evil, and thereby find happiness and prosperity.

But is this thought naturally expressed, and is the compatibility of the two radically different conceptions both expressed by the unqualified term "wisdom" really indicated? Or have we not rather the fundamentally different thought of a different writer simply laid alongside the preceding poem? Again, is a writer who wishes to express the supposed line of thought likely to have handled one part of his subject, the unattainable wisdom of God, so elaborately and the other part so briefly? The prosaic opening [28a] and the lack of balance in [28b.c] also suggest that [28] is not from the same hand as the rest of the chapter.

XXIX.–XXXI. Job's closing monologue. — These cc. were not originally, as in the present text they appear to be (see Introduction and Introductory Notes to 26, 28), merely the final section of Job's last speech in the debate; but the whole of what he says after the friends' contribution to the third round of speeches is complete. He now takes no further account of the friends; in his last, as in his opening speech (c. 3), he is concerned alone with himself and God (to whom, however, he directly addresses himself only in 30^{20-23}). The speech falls into three parts: (1) a pathetic survey of his life before calamity befell him, when God guarded him, men honoured him, and he helped men (c. 29); (2) the tragic contrast of the present—God assailing, men reviling him, in his humiliation (c. 30); and (3) a solemn reassertion that not in him or his conduct was any justification for the change, leading up to his final assertion of his readiness to meet God; this would appear to have been followed immediately, in the original poem, by Yahweh's reply (c. 38 ff.); but at present the speech(es) of Elihu (cc. 33–37) intervene. Thus the effect of Job's last speech has been doubly spoilt: by the dislocation or interpolation of what now immediately precedes it, and by the interpolation of what now follows it.

XXIX. Opening with a wish ([2]) that he might be again as in his earlier years, Job depicts his happiness then, finding, as the quiet tone of this part of the speech, and the detail with which he fills in the picture (ct. c. 3), suggest, a momentary relief from the present in this musing on the past.

XXIX. 1 And Job again took up his discourse, and said:
2 O that I were as in the months of old,
As in the days when God guarded me;
3 When he caused his lamp to shine above my head,
(When) by his light I walked through darkness;
4 As I was in the days of my ripeness,
When God ⸢screened⸣ my tent;

---

1. As 27^{1} (n.).

2 ff. Job's reminiscences open with what was the ground of all his happiness—God's guardianship of him, God's friendly presence with him ($^{2b-5a}$); he then very briefly refers to two immediate tokens of God's favour—his children gathered about him (^{5b}), and the affluence of his life (^{6}); he next dwells longer on the outcome of his affluence and of the manner in which he had used it—the esteem in which he was held by all, including the aged and the nobles ($^{7-11}$), and his practice of helping the weak and defenceless, making righteousness the warp and woof of his own life, and foiling violence and unrighteousness in others ($^{12-17}$); he then ($^{18-20}$) recalls how in those days he looked forward to an end so different from the present cruel reality—prosperity continuing right up to a peaceful death; and he closes ($^{21-25}$) with a return to the topic of $^{7-10}$, viz. the memory of the esteem which he had enjoyed, thus making a transition to what ($30^{1ff.}$) he feels so keenly now—the contempt that has fallen upon him. It has been questioned whether $^{21-25}$ was originally separated from $^{7-10}$; if not, and the chapter be rearranged in the order $^{1-10\ 21-25\ 11-20}$, the transition to c. 30 is still good, viz. from Job's expectation of prosperity continued up to a long-deferred death to the present bitter contrast.

2. *Guarded me*] cp. Nu. 6^{24}, Ps. 16^{1} 91^{11} $121^{7f.}$; ct. c. 13^{27}—in all these passages the same vb. שׁמר.

3. Cp. Ps. $18^{29(28)}$: God lighted a lamp above Job's head to shed its light upon his path, so that in the darkness he should not stumble over obstacles.

4. Job's memory is not of his "spring" or youth, but of his maturity, of the rich increase of his life's "autumn," when the fruits of God's favour and his piety were being gathered and

5 While yet the Almighty was with me,
(And) round about me were my children;
6 When my steps were washed with curds,
And the rock poured me out rivers of oil.
7 When I went out of (my) gate up to the city,
(And) in the broad place prepared my seat,
8 The young men saw me, and hid themselves,
And the aged rose up (and) stood;

---

enjoyed by him; his children were about him (^{5b}), but, as the Prologue shows, grown up; and the position of authority and respect among his neighbours, on which he chiefly dwells, fits in well with the years of ripe manhood; in certain connections the season of autumn or ripeness may disagreeably suggest winter and death, but it is part of Job's memory that in spite of the many years already lying behind him he looked forward to innumerable years yet to come (^{6}). It therefore seems unnecessary to emend away the term ripeness (see phil. n.).—*When God screened*] so 𝔊; cp. 1^{10}: 𝔐 *when the friendship* (cp. Ps. 25^{14}, Pr. 3^{32}: see phil. n. on. 15^{8}) *of God* (*rested*) *upon*: see phil. n.

5a. Nothing marred Job's welfare (^{6}), nor had he any evil turn of fortune to fear ($^{18-20}$), when God was still *with* (cp. Ps. 23^{4} 46^{8} etc.) him, protecting him and fending off evil, and not yet, as now (30^{21}), turned into his cruel opponent.—b. Cp. $1^{2.4f.}$.—*Children* (נערים) as 1^{19} (young men), and 2 S. 18^{29} of David's *adult* son Absalom.

6. Job's land flowed with milk (cp. and ct. 20^{17}) and oil—figures of his wealth.—*Curds*] cp. 20^{17} n.—*The rock*] possibly corrupt; if not, either: the rockiest portions of Job's land, which might naturally have been quite barren, or the rocky soil in which the olive flourishes, and the rock in which the oil-presses were cut out.

7. Job's great estate (c. 1) lay near a large (cp. $^{8-10}$) town; and in this large community he was held in the highest esteem, and in its affairs and in its public assemblies, held, according to the custom in Oriental cities, in the broad place (Ezr. 10^{9}, Neh. 8^{1}) or square within the city, he took a prominent part.

8. When Job reached the assembly the young men present

9 The princes refrained from speech,
And laid their hand on their mouth;
10 The voice of the nobles was ⌜dumb⌝,
And their tongue cleaved to the roof of their mouth.
11 For when the ear heard, it called me happy;
And when the eye saw, it attested me;

---

withdrew into the background, and even the aged, who had previously arrived and sat down, rose and remained standing till Job had taken his seat.

9, 10. And men in the highest position kept silence in order, as ^{21} expressly states, if $^{21-25}$ originally followed ^{10}, to hear what Job would advise; in this case $^{7-10}$ describes Job's entrance, $^{21-25}$ his speech and its effect: Bu.; but see below.

10. *Dumb*] 𝔐 erroneously (cp.^{8}) *hid themselves*: see phil. n.

11 ff. These verses contain further vivid pictures of Job's past; they also assign the reason for Job's position of esteem and authority ($^{7-10}$ + ? $^{21-25}$); but there is some little uncertainty as to the exact connection: of this and of the proposed transposition of $^{21-25}$, Dr. wrote: "Vv.$^{8-10}$ describe the respect shown to Job in the assembly of his native place; and the same thought is clearly resumed in $^{21-25}$; and Bu. Be. Du. St. Vo. would transpose $^{21-25}$ to follow ^{10}: Job's dream of a happy old age ($^{18-20}$) would then be forcibly followed at once by the description of the bitter reality in 30$^{1ff.}$. On the other hand, it might be argued that the *ground* of the respect which Job enjoyed ($^{11ff.}$) might be mentioned immediately after it was first referred to ($^{8-10}$). The ground of his respect (^{11}) is not merely (Bu.) the prosperity which he enjoyed, but the prosperity, combined with righteousness, which he used rightly, to succour the helpless and the needy ($^{12-13}$): there is thus no occasion with Bu. to regard vv.$^{12-13}$ as a gloss, suggested by a false interpretation of 'it attested me' (ותעידני), as though this meant witness to his righteousness rather than to his prosperity; it was not his prosperity, as such, but just the beneficent use of his prosperity that gained him his respect."

11. *Attested me*] *i.e.* bore witness to my wealth: cp. the parallel.

12 For I delivered the poor who cried (for help),
And the orphan and him that had no helper.
13 The blessing of him that was ready to perish came upon me,
And I caused the widow's heart to ring out joy.
14 I clothed myself with righteousness, and it clothed itself with me;
My justice was as a robe and a turban.
15 Eyes was I to the blind,
And feet to the lame was I.
16 A father was I to the poor,
And the cause of him whom I knew not I investigated.
17 And I broke the great teeth of the unrighteous,
And from his teeth made him drop the prey.
18 Then I said: "I shall die with my nest(lings),
And make my days as many as the (grains of) sand;

---

12. So, with slight verbal variations and in the 3rd pers., Ps. 72^{12}. In $^{12. 15-17}$ the lie direct is given to the charges of Eliphaz, 22^{6-9}.

13. *Him . . . ready to perish*] אובד, as 31^{19}, Pr. 31^{6}.

14. *It clothed itself in me*] it filled or possessed me: cp. Jg. 6^{34}: "the spirit of Yahweh clothed itself in Gideon": I wore righteousness and righteousness wore me: see phil. n. For the figure of clothing, cp. Is. 11^{5}, Ps. 132^{9}, of God, Is. 59^{17}. *Robe* (1^{20} n.) and *turban* (cp. Zec. 3^{5}) represent complete dress.

15. Job led (cp. Nu. 10^{31}) the blind, and helped the lame to walk.

16b. A case at law Job was always ready to look into, whether he had previous knowledge of the person claiming to be wronged or not, and, if the case were good, to carry it through.

17. The wrong-doer Job rendered harmless and deprived of his spoils: for the (implicit) figure, cp. Ps. 3^{8} $58^{7(6)}$.—*Great teeth . . . teeth*] Jl. 1^{6}, Pr. 30^{14}.

18. *With my nest*] nest as in Dt. 32^{11}, Is. 16^{2}, of the occupants of the nest; as he had lived (^{5b}), so Job hoped after innumerable (cp. Hab. 1^{9}, Ps. 139^{18}: also Gn. 13^{16}) days to die, not merely *in* his nest (RV.), *i.e.* in his house, but *with* his nestlings, *i.e.* surrounded by his children. Others render:

19 My root open to the waters,
And the night-mist lodging in my branches;
20 My glory fresh with me,
And my bow pliable in my hand."
21 Unto me men gave ear, and waited,
And kept silence for my counsel;
22 After I had spoken, they spoke not again,
And my speech dropped upon them;
23 And they waited for me as for the rain,
And their mouth they opened wide for the latter rain.
24 I laughed at them when they believed not,
And the light of my countenance they cast not down.

I shall die in my nest, And (*then*) *like the phœnix make my days many*; or, *I shall die in my nest, And* (*then*) *like the palm*, etc.; or emending, *I shall grow old in my nest, And multiply my days as the sand*: for a discussion of these and other suggestions, see phil. n.

19. Ct. 18^{16} (Bildad, of the unrighteous): with ^{a} cp. Ps. 1^{3}: on the reviving *night-mist* (38^{28}), see Is. 18^{4} n.

20. Conscious of his rectitude and kindness, and mindful of the maxim (Pr. 21^{21}) that those who make righteousness and kindness their aim find life and "glory," *i.e.* reputation among men, Job had trusted that his reputation and the position it gave him would never grow less, and that his power, symbolized by the bow, would remain the same (cp. Gn. 49^{24}).—*Pliable*] so Dr. (see phil. n.): Bu. *sprouting*, the old, dry bow putting forth fresh shoots like Aaron's rod (Nu. $17^{23\,(8)}$), which he thinks a possible hyperbole in poetry.

21–25. The vv. should perhaps follow [10]: see above.

21–23. Men waited silently for, and silently accepted, Job's advice, having no alteration or improvement to suggest, no desire to hear any one else; for his words and advice fell upon men like fertilizing rain (cp. Dt. 32^{2}), and were as eagerly expected and received as the latter rain (Dt. 11^{14}, Pr. 16^{15}, Hos. 6^{3}) that falls in April and May, refreshing the ripening crops.

24. "Job's clear-sighted counsel encouraged them, if they

25 I chose out their way and sat as chief,
And dwelt as a king in the army. . . .

---

were despondent: on the other hand (line 2), their despondency never clouded his cheerfulness"—Dr. (*Book of Job*). See phil. n.

25. *Their way*] what was best for them to do.—*In the army*] 𝔐 + *as one who comforteth mourners.*

XXX. 1–8. But now, in the present from which Job has just been wistfully looking back, the reputation he had hoped to enjoy up to his death has gone; whereas the aged and the noble used to do him reverence (29^{8-10}), now youngsters (or inferiors or "shepherd-boys": see phil. n.) mock at him. $^{2b-8}$ give, superfluously as it might seem, a detailed description of these mockers of Job (not of their fathers (^{1c}), for see ^{9}): they are low-born, of poor physique, outcasts of ill-repute, driven to shelter in caves and to scrape a bare subsistence from the wilderness. In ^{9} *but now* is repeated, and the contrast between man's past and present treatment of Job is resumed and continued to ^{10}, or, on one view of the interpretation of $^{11-15}$, to ^{15}. Again in ^{16} *but now* (in the present, but perhaps not in the original text) recurs; this time, however, to introduce (if the description of *man's* treatment of Job extends down to ^{15}) a fresh form of contrast—viz. between the tranquillity and prosperity and fair prospect of his past life and God's friendliness to him ($29^{2-6.\,18-20}$), and the pain and hopelessness and God's hostility in the present ($^{16-31}$). Thus whereas *but now* in ^{16} on one theory of interpretation would mark the beginning of the second main point of contrast, the same words in ^{9} are in any case merely resumptive of *but now* in ^{1} after a digression. How far such a digression is probable must be mainly a matter of taste; but a difference of tone also has been detected between the contempt expressed in $^{2-8}$ for, and the sympathy in 31^{15} with, those inferior to Job. If for these reasons we assume interpolation (of matter perhaps displaced from $24^{5ff.}$), it is better to omit $^{1-8}$ (Du.) in its entirety than only $^{3-7}$ (Bi.) or $^{2-8}$ (Peake), thus eliminating the disdainful note of ^{1} (as well as of $^{7f.}$), which Peake is ready to retain and excuse as due to Job's "too natural irritation"; then ^{9} introduces the contrast be-

XXX. 1 But now they have derided me,
That were of less age than I,
Whose fathers I disdained
To set with the dogs of my flock.
2 The strength, too, of their hands—of what good is it to me?
Within them firm vigour hath perished.
3 With want and with famine (each) is gaunt,
(Men), who gnaw the dry ground,
Whose ⌜mother⌝ (?) is devastation and desolation,
4 Who pluck salt-wort by the bushes,
Whose food is the root of the broom.

---

tween the former respect and the present contempt of the same people—the townsmen, young and old and noble. Peake, indeed, objects that these people are too remotely referred to if 29 ended at [20] (not [25]); yet, the antithesis in 31^{9} with *glory* in 29^{20} would be good. If [9] were resumptive of [1] we might rather have expected a different emphasis—ועתה להם or ועתה לאלה, And now to such as these am I become a song!

1. The v. is badly articulated and perhaps corrupt: 𝔊 om. *fathers.*—*The dogs of my flock*] contemptuous: cp. Is. $56^{10f.}$.

2a. Du.: Yea the strength of their hands faileth. This improves the connection, and makes the description begin with [3]. Alternatively [2b. 3a] might be combined into a distich.

3, 4. The reason for their weakness ([2]): they were starvelings, fed only on the scanty produce of the wilderness.

3. *Gnaw*] so (RV.) rather than *flee into* (AV.).—*Whose mother*] *i.e.* the source from which they get their nourishment: but the text and meaning are very uncertain: see phil. n.

4. *Salt-wort*] the Hebr. *malluaḥ* (cp. *melaḥ*, *salt*) here has, since Bochart's exhaustive discussion (*Hieroz.* lib. iii. cap. xvi.), been commonly identified with the sea orache, *Atriplex Halimus*, L.: it has "small, thick, sour-tasting leaves, which could be eaten . . . but would form very miserable food" (Tristram, *Natural History of the Bible*, p. 486).—*By the bushes*] *i.e.* under the shadow of the bushes where, when all else is dried up, a scanty vegetation still subsists. But the force of the prep. is

5 From the community they are driven forth,
  A cry is raised against them as against a thief;
6 In a gully of the wādys must they dwell,
  In holes of the earth and rocks.
7 Among the (desert-) bushes they bray:
  Under the nettles they are huddled together.

---

ambiguous. Possibly *and leaves of (desert-) bushes* should be read: see phil. n.—*The broom*] the Hebr. *rothem*, like the Ar. *ratam*, was a kind of broom, "the largest and most conspicuous shrub of these deserts"; the roots are very bitter, and are regarded by the Arabs as yielding the best [cp. Ps. 120^{4}] charcoal" (Robinson, *Bibl. Researches*, i. 299; cp. Hastings' *DB* ii. 825).—*Whose food*] Since an undesirable article of diet, and not an excellent fuel, suits the context, it is obviously unwise to render לחמם, with RVm., *to warm them*.

5. These ill-fed starvelings are suspected of pilfering (cp. 24^{6}); if, therefore, they ever appear near the homes of the better-to-do, the cry of "thief" is raised, and they are driven away.

6. They are ill-sheltered (cp. $24^{7f.}$), as well as ill-fed ($^{3f.}$).—*In a gully of the wādys*] or, less probably, *in the most dreaded of wādys*.

7. *They bray*] not, as the same vb., with a different prep. in 6^{5}, of their cry for or over their food; nor of the impression made by their uncouth speech, in their assemblies (^{b}), on the inhabitants of towns; but probably, though this particular meaning of the vb. cannot be paralleled, of the cry of lust. The v. describes them "misbegetting as they were themselves misbegotten" (^{8}: Peake): the parallelism is then excellent; *they bray*, like donkeys under the excitement of lust (cp. the neighing of the horses in Jer. 5^{8}), and ^{b} *copulate* with no better bed or screen than the rough and scanty growth of the desert affords.—*Nettles*] "The rendering is uncertain; but, whatever the *ḥārūl* may have been, it must have been a plant characteristic of uncultivated places (Job 30^{7}, Pr. 24^{31}). 'Thorns' [the rendering in RV. of *ḳimshonim*] in Pr. 24^{31} ought to be 'nettles' (cp. Hos. 9^{6}, Is. 34^{13}): hence *ḥārūl*, which stands in the parallel

8 Sons of the impious, sons of the nameless too,
They have been smitten out of the land.
9 And now I am become their song,
And I am become a (by-)word unto them.
10 They abhor me, they keep at a distance from me,
And they spare not to spit in my face.

---

clause, must be something different: and in Syriac *ḥārūl* signifies *a vetch* (hence RVm.). On the other hand, Job 30^7 seems to require some kind of shrub: and whereas the present passage [*i.e.* Z f. 2^9] implies that the *ḥārūl* would grow on a poor or salt soil, vetches love a good soil. Tristram (*NHB* 475) suggests the *Prickly Acanthus*: Post (*DB*, *s.v.*) some kind of thorny shrub such as the *Boxthorn*, three species of which are indigenous in Palestine, and grow in waste places and salty soil" (Dr. on Z f. 2^9).

8. They are sprung from an accursed disreputable race, not fearing God and enjoying no esteem of man. On *impious* (2^{10} n.), see phil. n.; and for the attitude of the settled population to the homeless, wandering people of the deserts, cp. Gn. $4^{11f.}$.

9. Perhaps the direct continuation of 29^{25} or ^{20}: see on ^{1}.—*Their song*] La. 3^{14}.

10a. Cp. $19^{18.\,19}$.—*In my face*] cp. Is. 50^6; or, *at the sight of me* (but see phil. n.), which is more compatible with "they keep at a distance from me," unless we are content, with Di., in spite of the order of the clauses, to explain: "they step forward to spit in my face, and then immediately step back again to show their loathing of me."

11–15. The text (see phil. notes) is so uncertain or ambiguous that it is impossible to determine with confidence whether these vv. refer (1) entirely to the treatment of Job by God and His hosts; or (2) entirely to the treatment of Job by the men of $^{1-8(10)}$ or of $29^{8-10.\,21-25}$; or (3) in part (^{11a}) to God's treatment of Job, in part to the consequential conduct towards him of men ($^{11b-15}$), and these (cp. ^{10a}) the men of $^{1-8(10)}$. The translation above is accommodated to the first and, on the whole, perhaps the most probable view; the third view,

11 For my (bow-)string he hath loosened, and he hath humbled me.
And my ⌜banner⌝ (?) from before me ⌜he⌝ hath ⌜cast down⌝ (?).

---

however, is favoured by two features of the existing text, viz. the change from the 3rd sing. in [11a] to the 3rd pl. in [11b–15] and the terms of [13b. c] (they set forward my calamity, they that have no helper) which are applicable neither to God's hosts, nor to the men of c. 29; on the other hand, the activities described in [11–15] are not naturally connected with helpless ([13c]) weaklings ([1–8]), and much of the existing text can only be defended by very artificial and improbable interpretation (see phil. notes). The second of the above views is only compatible with the existing text, if the sing. in [11a] refers to a typical individual of the class referred to in the plurals that follow; but such a meaning can be restored to the text by emendations no more extensive than those adopted above. If such were the meaning of the original passage it may have read, though in form [13. 14a] is very suspicious, somewhat as follows:

11 For, ⌜they⌝ have loosened ⌜their⌝ cord, and humbled me,
And they have cast off the bridle before me.
12 Against ⌜me⌝ the (low) brood riseth up, ‸
And heap up against me their paths of destruction.
13 They have broken up my path,
They have helped forward my calamity,
They have no helper
(Or, there is none to ⌜restrain⌝ them)
14 As through a wide breach they come on.
Under the crash ⌜I⌝ wallow,
15 Terrors are turned upon me;
My nobility ⌜is driven away⌝ like the wind,
And like a cloud has my welfare passed away.

11. *For*] the change in the attitude of men ([9. 10]) is due to God's hostility.—*My* (*bow-*)*string he hath loosened*] *i.e.* He (God unnamed as 3[20] n.) has disarmed me, rendered me defenceless: ct. 29[20]. If the K^{e}tib *his* for *my* were correct, the meaning, as

12 Against ⌜me his lines (of warriors)⌝ arise,‸
And heap up against me their paths of destruction.

13 . . . . . .
. . . . . .

14a As through a wide breach they come on.
14b Under the crash ⌜I⌝ wallow,
15 Terrors are turned upon me;

Del. pointed out, could scarcely be: God has prepared to shoot at Job (cp. 𝔊); but a violent and improbable anthropomorphism: God has taken off the cord or girdle about his loins to chastise Job with it. Other interpretations are discussed in the phil. n.

11b. *Banner . . . he*] On the emendations, see phil. n. If the reference is not to God but to Job's human opponents (see on 11-15), 𝔐 may be retained: *they have cast off the bridle*, which used to restrain them from unseemly conduct in my presence.

12a. God's warriors (restored to the text by a slight emendation) rise up against Job [a]; and make ready, as besiegers, to storm him [b].—*Against me*] 𝔐 *on the right hand.*—*His lines of warriors*] cp. 19^{12a}, and then with 12b cp. 19^{12b}. 𝔐 (*the low*) *brood* is commonly explained of the base-born crew that take advantage of Job's misfortunes to humiliate him. Between [a] and [b] in 𝔐 stand the words, *My feet have they sent on*, which has been explained to mean: they hunt me on from place to place; but see phil. n.

13-14a. The figure of 12 is carried on and developed in 14: God's warriors not only storm, but carry the fortress, pouring in through a breach in the walls so wide as to admit an irresistible number of assailants. The intervening lines in 𝔐 fall out of the figure and are abnormally short; they may conceal a parallel to 14a (see phil. n.).

13a. *They have broken up my path*] *i.e.* "Job's path of life, which they seek to make impracticable for him (cp. 19^{8})," Dr. —b, c. See above on 11-15, and phil. nn.

14. *I wallow*] cp. 𝔊; 𝔐 *they wallow*, or *roll themselves*, which has been explained to mean roll on irresistibly; but see phil. n.

My nobility is ⌜driven away⌝ like the wind,
And like a cloud has my welfare passed away.
16 But now upon me my soul pours itself out,
Days of affliction take hold of me:
17 By night my bones are corroded (and fall) away from me,
And (the pains) that gnaw me lie not down (to rest).
18 . . . . . .
. . . . . .

---

15. *My nobility*] "Job's princely dignity and reputation ($29^{8-10. 21-25}$)," Dr.—*My welfare*] or wealth, together with the esteem associated with it: cp. Is. 32^{5} (*noble*, נדיב ‖ wealthy, שוע): see n. there.

16. *But now*] see phil. n. and above on $^{1-8}$.—*Days*] read perhaps *terrors* or the like.

17. *By night* or (*and fall*) *away from me* should perhaps be omitted (see phil. n.).—b. Translated as above, the line means: I never get any alleviation from my pains, since they never retire to rest. Just possibly (see phil. n.) we should render *My fleshless bones lie not down to rest*, *i.e.* I, thus worn to the bone, cannot lie down even when night comes: for the attribution to the bones of personal activities, feelings and emotions, cp. *e.g.* 4^{14} (n.), Ps. 35^{10} 51^{10}, Is. 66^{14}.

18. This v. appears to be hopelessly obscure or corrupt. The existing text has been translated and, with great improbability, explained to mean: *By* (*the*) *great force*, viz. of my disease, or *by the great might* (23^{6}), viz. of God, *my* outer *raiment is disfigured*, owing to my body being emaciated, and my clothing, in consequence, hanging badly upon me: *it* (viz. my outer raiment) *binds* (lit. girds) *me about* as tightly *as the collar of my under garment*; but the collar of the Hebrew under garment was not tight-fitting, and to render Job's garment ill-fitting seems a trivial effect of the mighty power of God—not to speak of other improbabilities in this interpretation. If the v. referred to Job's emaciation affecting the appearance of his clothing, it would be better to read *through* (*my*) *great leanness* (cp. 16^{8}) for *by the great force*; but if the unfashionable set of Job's garments was due entirely, or as

19 [Behold, God] hath ⌜brought⌝ me ⌜down⌝ to the clay,
And I am become like dust and ashes.
20 I cry unto thee, and thou answerest me not;
I stand (in prayer), and thou lookest not at me.

---

some have supposed, partly, to swellings on his body, we might even, with Richter, introduce a *hapax legomenon* (פֹּחַ for כֹּחַ) into the text in order to secure a proper expression of the idea: *through great swelling* (of my body) my garment is disfigured; but the difficulty remains that in [b] while the vb. may, the comparison certainly does not, suggest tightness of fit. Possibly the reference to garments are entirely due to corruption, and as [16] spoke of the soul, [17] of the bones, so [18] spoke of the flesh (so, so far as [18a] is concerned, Bu.: see phil. n.); or (so 𝔊 in [a]) the text may have run: In (his) great might he (God: Ehrlich, Job's pain) seizeth my raiment; he taketh hold of me by the collar of my tunic (so Ehrlich and in part Sgf.): in this case "the underlying image is that of pursuit by an enemy: the pursuer seizes him by his garment and (v.[19]) throws him down" (Sgf.).

19. God has so humiliated Job that he is no longer of any account. That both lines are metaphorical is more probable than that only one is, though some (*e.g.* Bu.) interpret [a] metaphorically, [b] literally: God has so humiliated Job, that he, *i.e.* his diseased body, has a dusty appearance (cp. 7^{5}).—*Clay*] the word (חמר) is here a synonym of *dust* (עפר) and *ashes* (אפר): cp. 10^{9} 13^{12} 4^{19} 27^{16}: the rendering *mire* (RV.) is, therefore, slightly misleading; and the line may be compared with 16^{15} more closely than with 9^{31}.

20–23. Job now turns and addresses God, of whom he has just spoken in [19] if not already from [11] onwards. Job charges God with indifference to his cry, with actively enhancing his sufferings.

20b. The above translation, which gives complete parallelism, follows the reading of one MS only: the great majority of the MSS read *I stand and thou* (merely) *lookest at me*; one MS and 𝔖 *Thou standest and lookest at me.* See phil. n. For *I stand*, viz. in prayer, cp. Jer. 15^{1}.

21 Thou art turned into one that is cruel to me,
With the might of thy hand thou persecutest me.
22 Thou liftest me up into the wind, causing me to ride upon it,
And thou dissolvest me into the storm.
23 For I know that to Death thou wilt bring me back,
And to the appointed meeting-place for all living.
24 Howbeit, will not ⌜one sinking⌝ stretch out a hand?
Or in his calamity ⌜will not one⌝ cry for help?
25 Is it that I wept not for the unfortunate,
That my soul grieved not for the needy?

---

21. *Thou art turned into*] cp. Is. 63^{10}.—*Persecutest*] cp. 16^{9}; 𝔊 *scourgest.*

22. God in His might and majesty may ride on the wind (Ps. 18^{11}), but for man it is a giddy adventure, the prelude to (cp. $^{b\ 23}$) destruction. The figure of Job as the sport of the winds is rather differently expressed in 9^{17} (27^{21}).

23. *Death*] = The underworld, as 28^{22} al.—*Bring me back*] cp. 1^{21} n. With the phrase descriptive of Sheol in ^{b}, cp. $3^{17ff.}$.

24. 𝔐 is unintelligible: for attempts to extort a meaning from it, see phil. n. Emended as above, the v. is an apology for what Job recognizes to be a last fruitless appeal to God: drowning men catch at straws, and so Job, though (^{23}) certain of death, still involuntarily cries out for help. By an alternative emendation an entirely different meaning has been placed on the v., which then reads,

Howbeit, have ⌜I⌝ not stretched a (helping) hand to ⌜the poor⌝?
And ⌜was he not saved⌝ (by me) in his calamity?

This would obviously go admirably with ^{25}; and if it would come in abruptly, so also does ^{25} at present; on the other hand, reading in ^{24} אם לא for אך לא, and rendering, *If I have not stretched. . . . If I have not wept*, both verses would fit well in c. 31; with the pf. tenses, cp. then $31^{20.\ 21}$.

25. The v. in its present position (but see last n.) is explained as giving a reason for Job's cry for help (implied in ^{24b}): he had pitied others in their distress (cp. 29^{11-17}); why then in his own distress should he not appeal for compassion? Du.

26 For I looked for good, and evil came:
  And I waited for light, and darkness came.
27 My bowels have been made to boil, and are not silent;
  Days of affliction have come to meet me;
28 I go about (in) dark (attire) ⸢uncomforted⸣,
  I stand up in the assembly crying for help.
29 I am become a brother to jackals,
  And a companion to ostriches.

---

emends so as to make [25] continue the thought of [24] as emended and translated above: "Or does not ⸢he⸣ weep that is unfortunate? Is not ⸢the⸣ soul ⸢of him that is ready to perish⸣ grieved?"

26. A (second) reason for Job's appeal: he is himself one of the class referred to in [24], and in [25] also as emended by Du.: all his hopes (cp. 29[18–20]) are perished.

27. *My bowels have been made to boil*] cp. "My bowels are in a ferment," La. 1[20] 2[11]; there, of violent emotion at the distress of Jerusalem; here, of Job's emotion at his own calamities, or at the conflict between ([26]) his hope of good and fear, or ([27b]) actual experience, of evil. But [27b] even so is not a very natural parallel to [27a], is suspiciously similar to [16b], and may have displaced a line more closely parallel (cp. La. 1[20] 2[11]) to [a]. Bu. unnecessarily omits the whole v.—*Are not silent*] cp. of excited emotion, "my bowels sound, or make a noise," Is. 16[11]; "the sounding, or noise (RV. yearning), of thy bowels," 63[15].

28. *I go about in dark attire*] so Ps. 38[6]: cp. 35[14]; and see 5[11] n.—*Uncomforted*] so, by a slight emendation, Du.; 𝔐 *without the sun*, which has been explained to mean in a sunless, miserable condition; or, taken closely with the preceding word: dark, not with sunburn, but disease: see phil. n.—*In the assembly*] of those gathered around him (Del.), before people generally as many as are present about him, nearly (as Pr. 26[26]) = *openly* (Di.), or in the public assembly of the community—whether Job actually still attends it, or, as a leper, could do so, being of no importance (Bu.): see also phil. n.

29. Job's unalleviated and unpitied sufferings call forth from him, and no wonder ([24]), cries as melancholy as those of

30 My skin is black (and falls) off me,
And my bones are scorched with fever-heat.
31 And (the music of) my harp has turned into mourning,
And that of my pipe into sounds of them that weep.

---

jackals and ostriches (cp. Mic. 1⁸).—*Jackals*] see *EBi. s.v.*; others render *wolves* (*DB* i. 620*b*).

30a. See on 2⁷.—b. cp. Ps. 102⁴. The v. with its reference to a couple of the symptoms of Job's disease may be misplaced (cp. Bu.).

31. Job's harp and pipe instead of the merry and cheerful strains for which they were naturally adapted (21¹²) play now only the saddest airs.

XXXI. Job solemnly repudiates all sin such as might have deservedly drawn upon him the overwhelming misfortunes, which had turned his joy (c. 29) into mourning (c. 30: 30³¹). The repudiation consists of three elements: (*a*) a general claim that his life had been virtuous, with the grounds which had led him to the deliberate choice of virtue, ¹⁻⁴; (*b*) a repudiation in detail of a large number of sinful deeds, feelings and attitudes, ⁵⁻³⁴, ³⁸⁻⁴⁰; (*c*) a passionate assertion of his readiness to lay bare before God the record of his life, and of the conviction of integrity which he could bring with him into the presence of God, ³⁵⁻³⁷. At present (*c*) interrupts (*b*); but this must be due to misplacement, not, however, of ³⁵⁻³⁷ from the beginning of c. 31 (Che. *EBi.* 2479), but of ³⁸⁻⁴⁰ᵇ: these latter vv. originally stood somewhere between ⁵ and ³⁵, but whether after v.⁸, Bolducius (1637) as cited by Del.; after ¹², Bu.; after ¹⁵, Honth.; after ³², Me. Du.; after ²⁵, Kennicott, or after ³⁴, where in the uncertainty they are placed in the present translation, must be left undetermined. Having been accidentally omitted, the vv. were added at the close of the c.; just as Is. 38²¹ᶠ·, which originally stood after v.⁶ (see 2 K. 20⁶ᶠ·). It is possible (see n. on 30²⁴) that the c. has suffered further disarrangement, as Hatch, Bi. Du. argue. But (1) in spite of their absence from 𝔊, it is improbable that ¹⁻⁴ are an interpolation (Hatch, Bi. and Du.). For the vv. ring genuine, and if abrupt, are much less abrupt than ⁵⁻³⁴ would be without them.

XXXI. [1] I made a covenant with my eyes;
How, then, could I (even) look upon a virgin?

---

(2) In [5–34] no sufficient means exist for restoring the original (if and in so far as it differed from the present) order. In these vv. and [38–40] the repudiations of specific sins take the form of imprecations by Job on himself, *if* he had committed them; but, as Bu. has pointed out, the "if" clauses occur 15 or 16 times, the imprecatory clauses only 4 times ([8. 10. 22. 40]); the relative infrequency of the imprecatory clauses may well be due in part to the fortunes of the text, but not entirely; for there is at least much that is correct in Bu.'s further observation, that the "if" clauses are often combined into groups of *similar content* ([5. 7], [13. 16. 19. 20. 21], [24. 25. 26], [38. 39]) followed by a single imprecation; that at other times, as often elsewhere (G–K 149), the imprecatory clause is simply omitted; and that at times ([15f. 32f.]) the "if" clause is followed in lieu of an imprecation by a direct assertion that Job had pursued the very opposite course to that repudiated in the "if" clause. It would be a great mistake to reduce all this variety to the monotonous repetition of a single scheme.

1–4. Job, at that time unshaken in the belief that the portion allotted by God to wicked men was invariably disaster ([2. 3]), and convinced that nothing in his life would escape the eye of God, had from the first made it his rule not even to allow his eyes to wander where the lust of the eye might tempt him on to sinful act.

1. *I made a covenant with*] or, rather, *I imposed a covenant*, or *rule*, *on*, the prep. being not עם (see *Lex.* 503*b*), used when equal contracting parties are concerned, but ל (*ib.*) of the superior granting conditions to another: cp. *e.g.* 2 K. 11[4f.]: "Jehoiada made a covenant with (ל) them, and made them swear . . . and commanded them, saying, This is the thing that ye shall do." The terms of the rule imposed by Job on his eyes is not directly given, unless *a virgin* (בתולה) is merely a corruption of some general term such as נבלה, for *wickedness, impiety* (Peake); but in any case [2f.] suggest that the rule was perfectly general; and, in the present text, [1b] by the rhetorical

2 For what is the portion (apportioned) by God from above,
Or what the heritage (given) by the Almighty from the heights?
3 Is it not calamity for the unrighteous,
And disaster for the workers of iniquity?
4 Doth not *he* see my ways,
And number all my steps?
5 If I have walked with insincerity,
Or my foot hath hasted unto deceit;

---

question (see phil. n.) indirectly indicates its nature, instancing one of the subtler temptations against which the general rule was directed (cp. Is. 33^{15}, Ps. 119^{37}). Du. amends, unwisely: made a covenant . . . not to look upon a virgin; Job's covenant was much wider than this; and ^{b} does not exhaust but illustrates its application: for example, I refrained from even looking upon (cp. Is. 33^{15}, Ps. 119^{37}) a virgin; *a fortiori* from unchaste acts I kept myself free. The comparison with Mt. 5^{28} is interesting, but the ethical judgment is not quite the same; for here the look is avoided not as being in itself sinful, but as liable to lead on to outward conduct, the "ways" and "steps" of v.^{4}, and therefore to the punishment of sin (cp. Ecclus. 9^{5}).

2. Cp. 20^{29} $27^{13ff.}$ At the time when Job made his rule of life, he still held by the current doctrine of sin and suffering which had been maintained by the friends in the debate, and had been unquestioned by himself till his personal experience showed its falsehood. This doctrine then restrained him: cp. $^{14. 23. 28}$.

4. *He*] emphatic: he whose general principle of action is as indicated in $^{2. 3}$ and who, therefore, will punish me, if my ways are wrong.—b. cp. 14^{16}.

5–8. First section of the special repudiation: vv.$^{5. 7}$ "if" clauses, ^{6} parenthetic, ^{8} imprecation. Repudiation of dishonesty and (^{7}?) covetousness.

5. *Walked with*] made a companion of.—*Insincerity*] or falsehood (שׁוא, as Ps 12^{3} 26^{4}).—*Unto deceit*] to commit some act of deceit or fraud (cp. Is. 59^{7}), or, possibly, with personification

6 (Let me be weighed in just scales,
And let God know my integrity:)
7 If my step turned out of the way,
Or my heart went after my eyes,
Or ⌜ought⌝ clave to my hands,
8 Let me sow and another eat,
And let my produce be uprooted.
9 If mine heart was enticed on account of (another's) wife,
Or about the door of my neighbour I lay in wait,

---

as in [a], to (the home of) deceit, to make myself the housemate of deceit.

6. Job is not himself a fraud; if weighed he will be found full weight: cp. 1^1 n.

7. Job [a] had never departed from the way of rectitude, nor [b] consented to deprive his neighbour of anything of his that his eyes coveted, nor [c] had any fruit or stain of unjust gain or fraud ever stuck to his hands: this, in view of [8], seems the more specific thought lying behind the rather general expressions. With [a], cp. 23^{11}.—*After my eyes*] cp. Nu. 15^{39}; even if [b] is inconsistent with [1], it is not an inconsistency that calls for removal.—*Ought*] 𝕳 *a spot.* Cp. Dt. 13^{18}, 1 S. 12^5; see phil. n.

8. If Job had deprived others of what was rightly theirs ([5. 7]), let him be deprived of the fruit of his own labours. Cp. 5^5 $27^{16ff.}$; for the proverbial phrasing of [a], cp. Dt. 28^{30}.—*My produce*] so (RV.) rather than *my offspring* (RVm.): see phil. n.

9-12. Second section: repudiation of adultery: [9] "if" clause, [10] imprecation, [11f.] comment on the heinousness of the sin.

9. Job had never lurked about his neighbour's house, secretly watching till he should go out and Job so obtain access to his wife: cp. Pr. $7^{6. 9. 19}$.—*About*] in some cover in the neighbourhood, from which he could watch who came out of the door; not *at* (RV.; see phil. n.), *i.e.* in, or immediately in front of, the doorway, where the husband coming out must see him.

10 Then let my wife grind for another,
And let others bow down upon her.
11 For that were wickedness,
And that were iniquity (to be punished) by the judges:
12 For that were a fire that would consume unto Destruction,
And would ⌜burn⌝ all my crops.

---

10. *Grind for another*] become another's meanest slave (cp. Ex. 11^{5}, Is. 47^{2}, Jg. 16^{21}); so 𝔐; 𝕳 will also, and was probably intended to, bear a meaning parallel to ^b (see phil. n.). But whichever way ^a be taken, it probably implies that Job's wife in the supposed but unreal case is not of her own will to be unfaithful to him, but to fall a victim to another's violence: cp. Dt. 28^{30}. "It does not satisfy our ethical sense that for Job's offence his wife who had no share in it, but was rather herself the sufferer by it, should bear the greatest part of the punishment: that is only possible because the wife still counted essentially as the man's property," Du.

11. *Wickedness*] the term (זִמָּה) is a strong one (Hos. 6^{9}, Pr. 21^{27}), used especially in connection with sexual offences (Lv. 18^{17} 20^{14}, Jg. 20^{6}).—**b.** A flagrant offence not only subject to the divine punishment, but dealt with by the magistrates and the criminal law (Lv. 20^{10}).

12. *For*] parallel to *for* in ^11 and giving a second reason for ^10; but in ^12 it could be well spared, ^12 being then climactic to ^11. For adultery as a fire consuming the adulterer, see Pr. 6^{27-29}: cp. also Sir. 9^{8}.—*A fire that would consume unto Destruction*] a fire so fierce that it would not burn itself out till it had burnt down to Sheol: cp. Dt. 32^{22}.—*Destruction*] Hebr. *Abaddon*, as 26^{6} (n.).—*Burn*] 𝕳 *uproot*.—*Crops*] if *crops* is rightly read here, the misplaced section ^38–40 dealing also with Job's agriculture may have originally followed ^12.

13–20. Third section: repudiation of having disregarded the claims of (*a*) his own slaves, ^13–15; (*b*) others in need—the poor, the widow, the fatherless, ^16–20. The section contains several "if" clauses (^13. 16. 19, but not ^20) interspersed with vv. indicating principles restraining or guarding Job's conduct; but the imprecation is lacking, for the imprecation in ^22 too

13 If I rejected the cause of my slave,
Or of my maid, when they contended with me—
14 What then shall I do when God riseth up?
And when he cometh to inquire, what shall I answer him?
15 Did not he that in the womb made me make him?
And did not one fashion us in the womb?
16 If I withheld ought that the poor desired,
Or caused the eyes of the widow to fail;
17 Or ate my portion (of bread) alone,
And the fatherless ate not thereof—

---

exclusively corresponds to [21] to be regarded as referring to the whole group of repudiations in [13-21].

13. Job had never treated his slaves despotically, but had been governed by the thought ([15]) that the same God who had lavished such care on him in the womb (cp. $10^{8ff.}$) had lavished no less on his slaves; before the law slaves had some (Ex 21^{1-11}), but few rights; but Job, when his slaves had anything to urge against him, even though they might have been unable to make of it a case at law against him, did not turn them contemptuously away, but examined the case as that between fellow-creatures of one God, and, so far as might be, as he expected God would judge it at His assize ([14]).

14. *Riseth up*] to judgment; see phil. n.—*Cometh to inquire*] פקד as 7^{18} (see n. there).

15. Cp. Mal. 2^{10}.—The ethical standpoint of the v. (see on [13]) is very remarkable, and a striking illustration of the influence of the conception of God on conduct. *In the womb* is emphatic: earlier ($10^{8ff.}$) Job had argued that all the marvellous care lavished by God on him in the womb gave him a right to be surprised at God's present dealings with him, which seemed to be purely destructive; here a similar line of argument is implicit: what God has fashioned with care must be treated with care and respect by God's other creatures.

16. *Ought that the poor desired*] or, *the poor from* (*what they*) *desire*(*d*).—*The eyes . . . to fail*] through looking in vain for help: cp. 11^{20}.

17. Job shared his plain and simple everyday fare with the

18 For from my youth like a father he brought me up,
And from my mother's womb ⌜he⌝ led ⌜me⌝—
19 If I saw one ready to perish for lack of clothing,
And that the poor had no covering,
20 ⌜And⌝ his loins blessed me not,
And with the fleece of my sheep he obtained not warmth:
21 If I have swung my head against the ⌜perfect⌝,
When I saw my help in the gate,

---

fatherless: not merely on occasions of sacrifice when there was special and ample fare, but daily when his meal, according to custom (Nowack, *Arch.* i. 109 ff.), consisted mainly of bread (cp. the contrast in Pr. 17[1]), Job had shared his food with the fatherless.—*Portion*] (פת) denotes a piece of bread broken off the loaf (Lv. 2[6]), especially with a view to being consumed at a meal, but not necessarily a small portion (EV. "morsel"), for see 1 S. 28[22], 2 S. 12[3], Ru. 2[14].

18. Job's care for the needy ([17]) rested on another (cp. [15]) principle of religion, viz. gratitude for God's fatherly care of himself from his earliest days (cp. Ps. 22[10f.]), and the consequent desire to be like God in his conduct towards his needy fellow-men. The v. so read (see phil. n.) and understood is a little abrupt: unless with Du. we place [14] (which mentions God) between [17] and [18]. But 𝔐 (EV.) is not less abrupt:—(It was not the case that I disregarded the fatherless) for (on the contrary) from my youth up he grew up unto me as unto a father, and from my mother's womb I led her (*i.e.* the widow, [16]); or, emending [b] (so as to avoid the strange picture of Job from his babyhood guiding widows), and from his mother's womb I led him (the fatherless, as in [a]).

19. *Ready to perish*] 29[13] n.—*For lack of clothing . . . no covering*] 24[7].

20a. Cp. 29[13a].—*And*] 𝔐 *if*.

21–23. Fourth section: repudiation of having smitten with his hand him in whom no fault was to be found. V.[21], "if" clause; [22], imprecation on the offending part of Job's body; [23], reason for Job's conduct—the fear of God's lofty justice.

21. *Swung my hand*] in order to smite: cp. Is. 11[15] 19[1],

22 May my shoulder-blade fall from its shoulder,
And may my arm be broken from its socket.
23 For the dread of God [restrained me],
And by reason of his loftiness I could not (do so).
24 If I made gold my hope,
Or to fine gold (ever) said, (Thou art) my confidence;
25 If I rejoiced because my wealth was great,
And because my hand had secured much:—

Zech. 2^{13}. Job had not used undeserved violence, though he might in doing so have relied on his influence (cp. $29^{7ff.}$) to parry a charge brought by the injured party before the elders sitting for judgment in the *gate*-way (cp. 5^4 n.) of the city.—*Perfect*] 𝕳 *orphan*: see phil. n.

22. *Socket*] see phil. n.

23. Du. places this v. after [28], Bi. after [14].—**a.** 𝕳 For a terror (coming) unto me was the calamity ([3a]) of God; see phil. n.—*Loftiness*] 13^{11}.

24 f. Fifth section. "If" clauses without an expressed imprecation. Job repudiates the idolatry of wealth as in [26] another form of idolatry. He had no need of Eliphaz's exhortation (22^{23-26}); for all along he had put his trust not in gold, but—this is implicit—in God.—*Hope* || *confidence*] 8^{14}. God (as implicitly here) is the ground of *hope* (כסל) in Pr. 3^{26}, Ps. 78^7, of *confidence* (מבטח), *e.g.* in Ps. 71^5, Jer. 17^7: cp. especially Ps. 40^5, "the man who maketh (הַשָּׂם as שמתי here) Yahweh his confidence."

26–28. Sixth section: repudiation of having yielded to the temptation to worship the sun and moon. [26f.], "if" clauses; no expressed imprecation follows, but [28] (cp. [11]) emphasizes the heinousness of the offence. The worship of the heavenly bodies becomes prominent in Judah in the 7th cent., and would appear to have been prominent in the age of the poem, since it is the only form of outward idolatry specially repudiated. This prominence it is unnecessary, if not indeed ill-advised, to attribute to Persian influence; for, as Du. observes, the special prominence given to the majestic appearance of the *moon* may be Semitic rather than Persian. The direct appeal of the

26 If, seeing the sun when it shone,
And the moon moving gloriously along,
27 My heart was secretly enticed,
And my hand kissed my mouth,

---

beauty and awe of the heavens to the writer is obvious; but, like others (Ps. 8, 19; cp. Dt. 4^{19}) of similar sensibility to these impressions, he does not confound the moon with the Maker: these glorious bodies of light are God's creatures, their glory a witness to Him; to worship or pay homage to them is tantamount to denying the one true God, the creator of all. The passage is a striking illustration of the writer's convinced monotheism. Cp. the more direct development of the idea in Qor. 41^{37} 6^{76} (cited by Davidson).

26. *The sun*] the term אוֹר, commonly *light* or *luminary*, is best understood here of, or with special reference to, the sun (‖ the moon): cp. 37^{21}, Hab. 3^{4}.—*Shone*] or (note the impf.) *began to shine*, the reference being to the salutation of the rising sun in particular: cp. Tac. *Hist.* iii. 24, et orientem Solem (ita in Syria mos est) tertiani salutavere; and in the hymn to Aton (the sun) by the Egyptian king Ikhnaton (*c.* 1400 B.C.), "when thou risest in the horizon . . . the two lands are in daily festivity . . . their arms uplifted in adoration to thy dawning" (see, *e.g.*, Breasted, *History of Egypt*, 372).

27. *Secretly*] seems rather otiose, since the movements of the heart are essentially secret: in any case the repudiation is not of *secret idolatry*, an idolatry of the mind only, but of a particular idolatrous act [b], for which ([28]) the judges could exact a penalty (Dt. $17^{2f.}$).—*My hand kissed my mouth*] so as to throw a kiss to the sun or moon: the hand rather than the mouth is made subject of the vb., as being more active in throwing kisses. Kissing idols with the mouth as an act of adoration seems to be referred to in 1 K. 19^{18}, Hos. 13^{2}; and the act of throwing kisses to objects of worship, though not again alluded to in the OT., is frequently attested elsewhere: see S. Langdon, "Gesture in Sumerian and Babylonian Prayer," in the *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 1919, pp. 531–555 (with many illustrations).

28 That, too, were iniquity (to be punished) by the judges:
For I should have lied to God above.
29 If I rejoiced at the ruin of him that hated me,
And ⌜shouted for joy⌝ when evil found him;
30 Neither did I suffer my mouth to sin,
In asking his life with a curse.
31 If the men of my tent said not,
"Who is there that has not been sated with his meat?"

---

29 f. Seventh section: repudiation of having found pleasure in an enemy's misfortune, or of having attempted by cursing to secure his destruction. [29], "if" clause: [30], direct denial: no expressed imprecation. With the standard of conduct towards personal enemies here expressed, cp. Ex. $23^{4f.}$, Pr. 20^{22} $24^{17f.}$ $25^{21f.}$; ct. Bildad's standard in 8^{22} and that expressed in the words of 27^{7} (wrongly) attributed to Job. How far the so-called imprecatory Psalms (*e.g.* 58, 109, 137) betray an exactly contrary temper, depends on the extent to which in them purely personal enmity is subordinated to national and religious opposition.

29. *Shouted for joy*] 𝕳 *stirred myself up*, in joy: otherwise 17^{8}.

30. Not really parenthetical (RV.); but the direct negation of another sin is simply added by the copula to the indirect negation of v.[29] (so without the conjunction [32] is direct assertion after [31] indirect assertion): I did not rejoice at the ruin of my enemy, neither (AV.) did I curse him; the *Yea* of RV. is unsuitable; [30] is not climactic; the more striking disavowal is that of [29].—*In asking his life*] *i.e.* in asking God to take the life of his enemy; cp. 1 K. 3^{11} 19^{4}.

31 f. Eighth section: repudiation of having ever shown less than universal and unstinted hospitality. [31], "if" clause; [32], direct statement: no expressed imprecation.

31. 𝕳 in [b] may be rendered, *would that there were one not sated with his flesh*, that our master might be gratified by finding yet another recipient of his hospitality. In any case the point is: Job's hospitality had been so universally and richly shown to all strangers and passers-by ([32]) that the *men of his tent*, *i.e.*

32 The sojourner passed not the night in the street,
My doors I opened to the wayfarer.
33 If I concealed . . . my transgressions,
In hiding mine iniquity in my bosom;

---

his household and entourage, had asserted in praise of it that no one was to be found who had not eaten to his fill of Job's festal fare. Job, speaking of himself in [17], refers to his everyday fare of which the staple was bread; his household, speaking in praise of him, refer to exceptional fare, not eaten every day, viz. the flesh of animals (sacrificially) slain on special occasions, including commonly the advent of guests.—*Flesh*] a meat diet: cp. *e.g.* Nu. 11[4], Dt. 12[15], 1 S. 2[13. 15], 1 K. 17[6].

32. Cp. the narrative of Gn. 19[1f.], Jg. 19[15–21].

33 f. Ninth section: repudiation of hypocrisy. The whole is subordinate to the "if," and there is no expressed imprecation. The form of the section is suspicious, and the expression of the thought a little strange. At present a distich ([33]) is followed by a tristich ([34]): this is certainly not improved by omitting [33b] with 𝔊, and (with Du.) separating the obvious parallels ([34a. b]) from one another, in order to obtain in appearance two distichs, [33a. 34a] and [33b. c]. Nor is [34c] to be taken with [35c]! (Bi.). If the tristich is intolerable, it would be better to omit [34c] or to assume the loss before it of a line parallel to it. Moreover, at present [33a. b] are good parallels, the construction, to which Du. takes exception, being as in [30], to which he takes no exception. What Job appears to assert here is not that after committing sins he publicly confessed them, but that not having committed transgressions he had none to conceal; in mingling freely, as he had done (29[7ff.]), among men, he had been secured against fear of being condemned by the crowd, or losing the esteem of the clans of his own and neighbouring tribes, not by a skilfully maintained hypocrisy, but by a conscience wholly void of offence.

33. *If I concealed*] what follows in 𝔐 has been rendered *like Adam*, who, however, did not conceal sin through fear of *men* ([34]), or *like* (*ordinary*) *men*, which would cast a quite uncalled for reflection on the rest of mankind. Slightly emending, we

[34] Because I dreaded the great multitude,
And the contempt of the clans terrified me,
So that I kept silence, not going out of the door;

---

may obtain *from men*, which would be suitable, but before [34] otiose.

34. [a. b] The reasons which might have induced Job to conceal his transgressions, if he had committed any; [c] describes what would have been the consequence of the supposed action: as a matter of fact Job did not remain at home.—*Kept silence*] or rather, perhaps, *kept still* (דמם as in Jos. 10^{12}, 1 S. 14^{9}).

38-40. Tenth section (wrongly placed after [35-37]; see above p. 261 f.): repudiation of having committed any wrong in his agriculture. [38f.], "if" clauses parallel to, or closely related to, one another: [40], imprecation. What precise wrong Job is here repudiating is not clear. Certainly, if [38] were not followed by [39] it would be attractive with Du. to think of unfair exhaustion of the ground by depriving it of its year of rest (Ex. $23^{10f.}$, Lv. $23^{2f.}$ $26^{34f.}$), or the violation of some taboo such as the sowing of the land with two kinds of seed (Lv. 19^{19}). In this case the imprecation corresponds closely to the sin repudiated, but it is arbitrary with Du. to reject [39] as an ancient and incorrect attempt to explain [38]; for [39] reads as anything but a gloss, and its own unusual phrasing calls for explanation. Is it possible, however, that [39] is consistent with [38] as explained by Du.; is the *money* or payment of [39] a payment in discharge of religious claims connected with the land; and are the *owners* of [39b], the spirits of the land, the elves or the like, to which some have found allusion in 5^{23}; and instead of *caused . . . to expire* should we render *grieved* or disappointed? Unless we can admit this, we must start with the common interpretation of [39], and explain [38] in accordance with it: [39a] then means that Job had not withheld their wages from those who had worked the land for him, or the purchase price from the *former* owners ([39b]) of his fields; and [39b] that he had not, in violently appropriating (Is. 5^{8}, Mic. 2^{2}) the land, slain the former owners outright (cp. the case of Naboth, 1 K. 21), or caused them through loss of their patrimony to die of want. In this case [38] means

38 If against me my land cried out,
    And the furrows thereof wept together;
39 If I have eaten its produce without paying,
    And caused the owners thereof to expire;
40 Instead of wheat let thorns come forth,
    And instead of barley stinking (weeds).

---

that the land cries out for vengeance for a crime not committed directly against it, but on it, or in connection with it, against others. Certainly, in the nearest parallels, it is not the land, but the blood shed on it that cries out (16^{18}, Gn. 4^{10}); but since blood profanes (Nu. 35^{33} n., Dt. 32^{43}, Ps. 106^{38}) the land on which it is shed, we may perhaps infer that the land itself could be regarded as wronged by such crime, and as itself crying out for vengeance, and perhaps even as weeping (^{38b}), though this last would certainly be more naturally said in the case of a wrong more directly and exclusively done to the land: with the cry in this case, cp. the cry of the stones, apparently of buildings built or procured violently and unjustly, in Hab. 2^{11}.

38. *Against me*] emphatic: unlike that of some men (on the usual interpretation of $^{38f.}$, cp. 24^{2}), none of my ground had cause to cry for vengeance.—*My land*] the phrase is most natural on Du.'s interpretation (see above); on the usual interpretation it means that part of my land which I had obtained by fraud or violence.

39. *Produce*] lit. *strength*: so Gn. 4^{12}.—*Paying*] lit. *silver, money*.—*Owners*] or *owner*: cp. Ex. 21^{29}, Is. 1^{3}; G–K. 124 i.

40. On account of the murder of his brother, the land tilled by Cain was no longer to yield its strength; the imprecation of a similar misfortune, therefore, cannot prove, as Du. claims, that the crime repudiated here by Job was not the violent appropriation of land and causing the death of its former owners. No doubt restoration to the lawful owners or their heirs would have been the correct reparation; but the prayer that no good might come of ill-gotten possessions is far from unnatural. At the same time, as remarked above, ^{40} would be even more appropriate on Du.'s interpretation of ^{38}.

35–37. Conclusion of the speech ($^{38-40}$ being misplaced):

35 Oh that ⌜*God* would⌝ hear me!—
Behold my mark—that *the Almighty* would answer me!

. . . .

And the scroll which my accuser hath written;

Job expresses a final wish that God would answer him, and a conviction that (in this case) he would be able triumphantly to maintain his innocence and integrity. The tone of desire in [35] and of triumph in [36f.] is clear; but in detail the passage is extraordinarily ambiguous, and has received many different interpretations. In large part this ambiguity may be due to the probable loss of a line, as indicated above, between [35b] and [35c], in part also, perhaps, to some further textual corruption.

35. *Oh that God would hear me*] 𝔐 *Oh that I had one to hear me*, *i.e.* as variously understood, would that God, or some sympathetic human ear, to which he may entrust the declaration he is about to make (cp. Peake), or (Hi.) an arbitrator who will decide between (cp. 9[33]) God and himself, would listen to Job.—*Behold my mark*] parenthetical; Bi. Hoffm., assuming that תו already was and is here used as the name of the last letter of the Hebrew alphabet, render, Behold my Taw, (*i.e.* my last word is said): (now) let the Almighty answer me. But more probably (unless, as may well be, the word is merely due to a corruption of the text) *Taw* has here the more general sense of *mark* (cp. Ezk. 9[4.6]†), whether it signifies a mark resembling the early Taw, X, in lieu of an actual signature, or, which is more probable, since Job is scarcely to be thought of as incapable of writing, the signature itself; in either case, it implies a document thereby acknowledged or attested by Job. On the other hand, apart from this particular interpretation, there is no indication of such a document: for the document of [35c] is obviously something different, and the vbs. of [35a. b], though they may be compatible with a written document, which God is to answer, certainly do not require it, but more readily suggest *spoken* words of Job which God is to hear and answer. If, however, the lines implied a document signed by Job, of what nature was it? It is commonly held to be a *document* containing "the protestations of his innocence" just *spoken*, or

similar assertions of innocence (Da. Dr. Peake, Richter, Honth.): but (1) protestations of innocence do not naturally demand an answer, they are rather themselves answers to a charge: (2) the protestations just made have taken the form of imprecations; the natural "answer" of God to an imprecation would be to inflict the ill imprecated. Others (Ew. Bu. Du.) see in the document signed by Job his charge against God: Job "the accused has become the accuser. His document is first presented: it is accordingly the charge: the answer, *i.e.* the defence of his opponent, is not yet forthcoming: he charges God with violating justice (27[2]), and of this charge He is said to be unable to clear Himself. Complete confidence in his victory over God with a justification of the charge in its entire extent marks accordingly this conclusion of Job's speech" (Bu.). Others combine (Hi.), or (Di.) leave as alternative constituents, in the book charge and defence. If we might follow 𝔗𝔙 AV. (which last is not a rendering of 𝔐), this ambiguous book disappears from the text, and [35b] becomes completely parallel to [35a] without any disturbing parenthesis: in this case (emending תוי into תאותי) render, Behold my desire (is that) the Almighty may answer me (see phil. n.).—*That the Almighty would answer me*] the words may also be rendered: let the Almighty answer me.—*And the scroll which my accuser hath written*] these words have been taken (1) as dependent on Oh that in [35a]; And (that I had) the scroll, etc. (EV.), [35b] being parenthetical; or (2) on Behold in [35b]; Behold here is my signature . . . and the scroll, etc., the last clause of [35b] (let the Almighty answer me) being then parenthetic (Del. Me.); or (3) as a *casus pendens* to [36]: As for the scroll which mine accuser hath written—Upon my shoulder would I bear it, etc. (𝔊 Hi. Bu.). All these suggestions are unsatisfactory in themselves and involve a tristich ([35a. b. c] or [35c. 36a. b]); and it is preferable to assume the loss of a line. Du. would prefix to [35c] such a line as: would that I had the roll. But the last line, if such there was, may, of course, have been very different from this: it must be remembered that [35c] is most naturally (though not in the existing and probably mutilated context) rendered: And a scroll hath my accuser written. Such are the ambiguities

[36] Surely upon my shoulder would I carry it,
I would bind it around me as a crown;

---

of construction: further ambiguities of detail remain.—*The scroll*] so the Heb. ספר is best rendered here, if it is the object of the vb. in [36]: a scroll, but not a book (RVm.), may be pictured as bound round the head or spread over the back of the neck. For *scroll*, cp. Is. 34[4]: "the heavens shall be rolled up like a scroll." In form a scroll, in virtue of its contents it is a legal document (cp. Dt. 24[1] (EV. bill), Jer. 32[10f.] (EV. deed)); and if written by Job's accuser it is a written statement of the charges made against him, an indictment. The custom of accuser and accused (cp. ? [35b]) furnishing a written statement of the accusation and defence is attested for Egypt at least by Diod. (i. 75).—*My accuser*] or *opponent* (at law): see phil. n. This has been taken collectively as referring to the three friends of Job (so, *e.g.*, Del. Che. in *EBi.* 2479); but more frequently, in its more natural singular sense, as referring to God (so Di. Da. Bu. Du. Peake): this involves, indeed, a sudden change from the attitude towards God in the appeal of [35a. b] and a further change in [37a] where God appears as judge, but (so Di.) is in accord with 9[3. 14f. 32] 10[2] 13[19] 23[6] 40[2].

36. If, as he desired [35c], God's accusations against him were written on a scroll and given to him, so confident is Job in his innocence of the sins to which his sufferings appear to point, that he would receive the scroll without fear or shame, on the other hand would display it openly on his person, and wear it proudly like a crown of honour—treating the very accusations of God (which would turn out to be no accusations) as so many marks of honour, and ([37b]) handing back to God the scroll, not humbly like a criminal, but proudly like a prince: so substantially Da. Di. Dr. Du. Peake; and this is the least bizarre interpretation of the existing text.—*Carry it*] 𝔐 can, of course, equally well be translated *carry him*; and it has actually been maintained that Job is expressing his intention of carrying on his shoulder either (1) victoriously (cp. Hoffmann), or as a cherished child (Ehrlich), the one who fulfils his wish ([35a]) by listening to him, *i.e.* (Hoffm.) God Himself; or (2) the accuser

37 I would declare the number of my steps,
Like a prince I would present it.
40c The words of Job are completed.

---

of ^{35c}.—*Upon my shoulder*] cp. Is. 22^{22}: the Heb. term שכם denotes the back of the neck or shoulder, on which burdens were borne (*e.g.* Gn. 49^{15}); the scroll is thus pictured rather strangely, as spread out to be read not by those who meet Job, but by those who come up behind him. Some, however, think the suggestion is that the scroll is worn as an easy burden (*Lex.* 1014*a*): the accusations would hang lightly on Job. The idiom would, of course, at once suit the personal reference (see last n.) if that were otherwise tolerable: for persons borne on the shoulder see Gn. 21^{14}; and for the figure of a crown applied to persons, see Pr. 12^{4} 17^{6}.

37. The number of my steps] all my actions; cp. ^{4} (steps ‖ ways), 14^{16}.—*I would present it*] a better parallel to ^{a} than the questionable alternative rendering: I would go near unto him (see phil. n.).

40c. An editorial note: cp. Ps. 72^{20}, Jer. 51^{64} last clause. Freely rendered the clause was connected by 𝔊 with 32^{1} (so Bu.).

XXXII.–XXXVII. Elihu.—This entire section of the book must for reasons given in the Introd. §§ 22–29 be regarded as an interpolation. It consists scarcely of four speeches, but of a single speech outwardly divided in the existing text into four sections by means of the formulæ in 34^{1} 35^{1} (as 3^{1} etc.) and 36^{1} (cp. 27^{1} 29^{1}). In some, perhaps even in all cases, this formula may not be original; the additional occurrences in 𝔊 (32^{17} and HP^{23} in 34^{16}; cp. the variant in ^{A} 33^{31}) point at least to a tendency to multiply the use of it; still in 34^{1} the formula stands after words that suggest a pause, and before Elihu turns to address a fresh party; and with 36^{2} a fresh main part of the speech begins. As Job in his speeches now addresses the friends, now God, and now soliloquizes, so Elihu in part addresses himself to the friends (32^{6-14}, including ^{10}: see n.), in part falls rather into the tone of soliloquy (32^{15-22}), in part addresses the wise men (34^{2-15}), or others (37^{2}, if 𝔐 be correct), in the audience, but mainly addresses Job (33^{1-33} 34^{16}–37^{24}, except 37^{2} 𝔐 and

XXXII. 1 And these three men ceased to answer Job, because he thought himself righteous. 2 And Elihu the son of Barachel the Buzite, of the clan of Ram, was hot with anger: against Job he was hot with anger, because he considered himself righteous rather than God; 3 and against his three

---

? 35^{16}). The speech falls into three main parts: (1) in 32^{6}–33^{7} by way of introduction Elihu explains to the three friends ($32^{6\text{-}14}$) and to Job ($33^{1\text{-}7}$) and to himself ($32^{15\text{-}22}$) why or how he is going to intervene; (2) in 33^{8}–35^{16}, thrice citing or summarizing words of Job ($33^{9\text{-}11}$ $34^{5.6}$ $35^{2f.}$), Elihu refutes the claim made in them by Job to be righteous and not to have deserved the sufferings inflicted on him by God; (3) in 36, 37 he presents independently his own view of the greatness of God, of His creative activity, and of His government of men. Certainly much common ground is covered in (2) and (3), and the distinction between them would largely fall away, if Du.'s reconstruction (see on 35^{15}) of 35^{15}–36^{2} were adopted.

XXXII. 1–6a.—Prose introduction to the speeches: angry alike with Job for maintaining that he was righteous ^{2}, and with the friends for at last silently acquiescing ^{3}, Elihu breaks the silence, which he had observed hitherto out of regard for the superior age of the friends, not at all from any doubt as to how Job could be shown to be in the wrong ^{4}.—For inconclusive reasons, Bu. Hoffm. regard as interpolated the vv. ($^{2\text{-}5}$) which give the grounds (cp. $^{6ff.}$) for Elihu's intervention.

1. *Three men*] so also in ^{5} (*i.e.* both in what Bu. (see last n.) considers the original and the secondary part of this introduction) Job's three friends are named. The change from the term friends (2^{11} 19^{21} 42^{10}: here also in ^{3}𝔐 and in $^{1.3}$𝔊; in ^{5}Θ = 𝔐) is due to a difference of writer rather than to "the correct feeling that they could no longer be termed" friends (Bu.).

2. *Elihu, the son of Barachel*] the father's name is added, not because so much stress is laid on Elihu's youth (Bu.), but in accordance with a common custom when a name is introduced into documents (cp. *e.g.* Is. 1^{1}, Jer. 1^{1}, Ezk. 1^{3}, the Elephantiné papyri, *passim*). In observing this custom this writer differs from the author of the Prologue. Both names

friends he was hot with anger, because they had found no answer, and had not shown Job to be unrighteous. [4] Now Elihu had waited for Job with words, because they were older in days than he. [5] And when Elihu saw that there was no answer in the mouth of the three men, he was hot with anger. [6] And Elihu the son of Barachel the Buzite answered and said:

I am young in days,
 Whereas ye are aged;
Therefore I was in dread and afraid
 To declare my knowledge to you.

---

may have been selected by the interpolator on account of their meaning: Elihu (1 S. 1^{1}, 1 Ch. 12^{20} 26^{7} 27^{18}) means (my) God is he, and Barachel (^{6f}) bless, O God, or bless God, or God hath blessed or blesses (see phil. n.). Ba-rik-ili is the name of several (Jewish) persons named in the documents of Murashu sons (temp. Artaxerxes I., see *Bab. Expedition of the Univ. of Pennsylvania*, Series A, vol. ix. p. 52).—*The Buzite*] since Buz was the "brother" (Gn. 22^{21}) of Uṣ. (1^{1}), Elihu is represented as more closely akin than the friends to Job.—*Of the clan of Ram*] whereas Buz as a son of Nahor is *Aramaic*, Ram is only known as Jewish or Jerachmeelite (Ru. 4^{19}, 1 Ch. $2^{9.25}$). Disregarding this, the author perhaps selected this clan name, too, on account of its meaning—lofty, exalted. In any case it is unwise to treat Ram as an abbreviation of Aram in order to make both descriptions of Elihu Aramaic, or Buzite as equivalent to Boʿazite (בזי = בעזי: cp. Ru. 4^{21}) to make them both Jewish.—*Rather than*] less probably, *before*: see phil. n.

3. *No answer*] no further answer: cp. $^{15f.}$—*Had not*] less probably *yet had*: see phil. n.

4a. See phil. n.

6–22. Elihu, not (see ^{10} n.) addressing Job till 33^{1}, explains, partly ($^{6-14}$) in direct address to the three friends, partly ($^{15-22}$) soliloquizing, why he had kept silent hitherto, and why he is now speaking. He had kept silence, not because he had any hesitation as to the right thing to say, but merely from conventional respect for old men ($^{6.7}$). He had been confident enough about his own knowledge all along, knowing whence

7 I said, "Days should speak,
And multitude of years make known wisdom."
8 But indeed it is the spirit in man,
And the breath of the Almighty, which makes them understand.

---

it came—from God Himself ([8]). God, as he thus knows by his own experience, gives knowledge to the young; but since He may sometimes impart to old men also, Elihu had given the old men before him ([7. 11]), Eliphaz, Bildad and Ṣophar, the opportunity of showing whether they were inspired as well as old: the event had proved that they were not ([9. 12b. c 15f.]); for he is not to be put off with the excuse that the task set them had been so hard that only God Himself could discharge it ([13]): he will soon show the hollowness of this excuse, when he gets to work himself. The words of these old dotards have dried up ([15b]); how different is it with him! He is so uncomfortably flooded with words that, had he no better reason, he must needs speak in order to relieve the intellectual stomach-ache which his many words of wisdom, so long kept inside, have given him ([18-20]). And when he speaks, let no one expect compliments; for they will not get them ([21f.]). This apology is not a dramatic description of a speaker whose contribution the writer ridicules as that of a bombastic youth, but a self-revelation of the tone and temper of the writer himself.

8. The dispute whether *the spirit* and *the breath* are merely the spirit of God which imparts life (27[3] 33[4]) and intelligence to all men (Gn. 2[7]), or the spirit inspiring or giving *special* knowledge to prophets (cp. Joel 3[1]), is, in the present connection, rather beside the point: the spirit of God which is imparted to all men and the spirit given in inspiration, or to impart exceptional skill and ability, to *special* men (Is. 11[2] n., Nu. 27[18], Gen. 41[38f.], Ex. 31[3]; cp. c. 33[4b] n.), are not two essentially different things, but the same spirit in less or greater measure, working for and achieving different ends. Both [8] and [9], though expressed in perfectly general terms, have a specific implication: [9] indirectly asserts that the three friends (cp [10]), in spite of their age, are not wise, and [8] that

9 It is not ⌜the aged⌝ that are wise,
  Nor is it the old that understand right;
10 Therefore I say, Listen to me;
  I also will declare my knowledge.
11 Behold I waited for your words,
  I listened for your wise sayings;
 Whilst ye sought out words,
12 Even unto you I attended;
 And behold there was none to convict Job,
  None among you to answer his sayings.
13 (Beware) lest ye say, "We have found wisdom;
  God may drive him away, not man."
14 ⌜I will⌝ not set forth ⌜such⌝ words ⌜as these⌝,
  Nor will I answer him with your sayings.

Elihu through the presence in him of the spirit of God (cp. Gn. $41^{38f.}$), in spite of his youth, is wise.

9. Cp. 12^{12} 15^{10}.—𝔐 *many*, or *the great* (see phil. n.).—*The aged*] Eliphaz, Bildad and Ṣophar in particular are intended: see on ^{8}.

10–17. If $^{11\text{-}16}$ were placed after ^{7}, and ^{17} omitted as a variant of ^{10}, the reasons for Elihu's former silence ($^{6f.\ 11f.}$) and present speech ($^{16.\ 8f.}$) would stand together with $^{13\text{-}15}$ as transitional. But neither this nor other proposed reconstructions (see phil. n.) can be regarded as certain.

10. *Listen*] sing. in most Hebrew MSS, but, in spite of Di.'s argument (see phil. n.), the pl., *Listen ye*, should be read.

11 f. Elihu had waited, but in vain, for the friends to prove their wisdom by putting Job in the wrong.

13. "Do not think you have found in Job a wisdom which only God can overcome" (Dr.). An alternative rendering, scarcely to be adopted, is: Lest ye say, We have found wisdom, God (speaking through Elihu) will drive him away, not man (*i.e.* Elihu uttering merely his own wisdom); so Richter: cp. AV. RVm.

14a. 𝔐. *And he hath not set forth words against me*: and so, slightly paraphrased, RV. 𝔐 is commonly supposed to mean "Job has not yet tried conclusions with me" (Dr.). In any case the meaning is: when I have spoken, in a manner very different from you (^{14b}, if not also ^{14a}), you will see that it is not necessary to call in God in person to vanquish Job; a

15 They are dismayed, they answer no more;
Words have failed them.
16 And am I to wait, because they speak not,
Because they have stood still, (and) have answered no more?
17 I also will give my allotted answer,
I will declare my knowledge, I too.
18 For I am full of words,
The breath in my belly constrains me;
19 Behold, my belly is as wine that hath no vent;
Like skins (filled with) new (wine) it is ready to burst.
20 Let me speak that I may get relief;
Let me open my lips and answer.
21 Let me not, pray, show partiality to any man;
Neither will I give flattering titles to any creature;

---

man, viz. myself, though youthful, yet inspired, will do what you, though old, have failed to do. The promise not to answer like the friends is not in reality fulfilled: in substance the speeches of Elihu supply nothing that the friends have not previously alleged.

15–22. The tone of soliloquy (see on xxxii.–xxxvii.) imparted to these vv. by [15-16] can be avoided by omissions (of [15-17], Bu.) or transposition (see phil. n. on [10-17]); but for such there is no sufficient independent reason.

15. *Have failed*] lit. *have moved away from.*

17. Cp. [10].—*Give my allotted answer*] lit. *answer my portion*; the meaning, in the context, is scarcely, I will give my portion of the reply needed to convict Job, but (since Elihu is convinced that he has himself a complete answer) I will offer in reply the portion of knowledge which has fallen to me from God, and that portion will constitute a complete answer.

18–20. Elihu is painfully full of words and of the breath in which they should pour forth: he must therefore get his words out in speech, or else burst like tightly closed skins containing wine in fermentation.—*My belly*] briefly for "the words in my belly," the words strictly corresponding to the wine, the belly to the skins ([b]); similarly *new wine-skins* (𝔐) is briefly put for skins containing new wine; new skins in themselves are least liable to break, and as such are the proper receptacles for new wine (Mt. 9[17]).

22 For I cannot give flattering titles;
My Maker would soon take me away.

XXXIII. 1 Howbeit, hear now, O Job, my speech,
And listen to all my words.
2 Behold now, I have opened my mouth,
My tongue in my palate hath spoken.
3 My heart ⌜overflows⌝ with sayings ⌜of⌝ knowledge;
My lips speak that which is pure.
4 The spirit of God hath made me,
And the breath of the Almighty giveth me life.

---

22. He will not give fair titles to men ^{21}, because he could not ^{22a}, if he wished, and would not, if he could, for fear of divine punishment, ^{22b}.

XXXIII. 1–7. Elihu now turns to Job, with an invitation to listen ($^{1f.}$) and if possible to answer (^{5}), repeating to him ($^{3f.}$), what he had already said to the friends ($32^{8.\ 18ff.}$), that he is full of words, due to the action on him of the divine spirit, and assuring him that they meet on equal terms ($^{6f.}$) as follow human-beings.

1. *O Job*] Elihu, unlike the friends, addresses Job by name (^{31} 37^{14}; cp. the references to Job by name in $34^{5.\ 7.\ 35f.}$ 35^{16}). The difference is not completely explained by the fact that, unlike the friends, he does not address himself exclusively to Job. The change from address to the friends to address to Job would have been sufficiently marked by the change from 2nd p. pl. to 2nd p. sing. (cp. 34^{16} after 34^{10}). The difference is rather due to difference of writers.

2. The poverty of this v. seems to Bu. to be cured by making it hypothetical: If I have opened my mouth . . . ^{3} my heart, etc.

3. 𝔐 my words (utter) the uprightness (6^{25}) of my heart (Dt. 9^{5}, Ps. 119^{7}, 1 Ch. 29^{17}); and the knowledge of my lips they speak sincerely: see phil. n.

4. Cp. 32^{8} n.—"Elihu appeals to the Divine spirit which both created him and maintains him in life: it is a spirit which is common to all men; but 'in his animated zeal for God against the charges of Job he feels that it is within him in a powerful degree and gives him a higher wisdom than ordinary' (Dav.:

5 If thou canst, answer me;
  Draw up before me, (and) stand forth.
6 Behold, I (stand) towards God even as thou (dost);
  From the (same piece of) clay I also was snipped off.
7 Behold, my terror shall not affright thee,
  And my urgency shall not be heavy upon thee.
8 Nevertheless thou said'st in my hearing,
  And I heard the voice of (thy) words:—

---

similarly Del.). It thus both guarantees his sincerity [3], and gives him strength to confront Job confidently [5]. Bu. Be. Du. omit the v. as in a sense a duplicate of [6], premature here, and superfluous after [6]. But [6] speaks only of the *material* side of man's nature; this v. emphasizes his being made and kept alive by God's spirit: so that the points of view of the two verses are different. Peake would transpose to follow [6]; but the point in [6] is that Elihu is a *man*, made from the dust like Job, and therefore [7] he will not browbeat him like God; between [6] and [7] the thought of the Divine spirit as his maker and sustainer would be out of place" (Dr.).

5. *Draw up*] *sc*. your case, or arguments: or, fig., your line of battle: see phil. n.

6b. Cp. 10[9].—*From the clay . . . snipped off*] cp. the phrase, used of Eabani's creation in the Gilgamesh Epic (Tab. 1, col. 2, l. 34), "snipped off clay" (*ṭi-ṭa iḳ-ta-ri-iṣ*), and also that in the cosmological fragment cited in Rogers, *CP* p. 45, *Ea iḳ-ru-ṣa ṭi-ṭa-*[*am*] *ib-ni il libitti*, Ea broke off the clay, he created the god of bricks.

7. Elihu comes "not in terror as the King of kings": cp. 9[34] 13[21].

8–33. This, the first part of Elihu's refutation, begins ([9-11 (13)]), like the two subsequent parts (34[5, 6] 35[2, 3]), with a summary of Job's position as Elihu understands it. Job has asserted [8] (1) that he is without sin,[9]; (2) that consequently God's hard treatment of him proceeds from mere enmity, and is without moral justification or purpose, [10f.]; (3) that God refuses to answer him, [12f.] (corrected text). Elihu addresses himself primarily to (3), though his reply even to this is so far indirectly expressed that he answers Job's assertion about his

own *particular* case by reference to God's *general* treatment of men; still more indirectly—though clearly enough, does he express his dissent from (1) and (2). Job's assertion that God does not answer *him*, Elihu argues, arises from his not discerning God's many modes of speaking to *men*, ^{14}, as for example (1) by vision, $^{15-17}$; (2) through suffering, $^{19ff.}$. Suffering rightly received (not wrongly, as by Job), through the activity of angels, leads (good) men to say, "I have sinned," ^{27} (not, like Job, ^{9}, "I am sinless"): and, thereupon, God redeems the sufferer. In whatever way God speaks or answers, it is with the aim of rescuing men from sin, and so from the suffering which sin entails, $^{17f.\ 29f.}$. Let Job answer Elihu if he can, and if not, silently listen to him, $^{30-33}$.

8–13. Here as in $34^{5f.}$ $35^{2f.}$ Elihu makes, as Ṣophar had done in 11^{4}, his starting-point words used by Job, or thought by Elihu (for the quotations are not all exact) to have been used by him in the course of the debate with the friends. But Bu. exaggerates and misrepresents the significance of this when he says: "the friends seek Job's sins in his conduct (Tun) before the time of his sufferings, Elihu only in his assertions, since these have befallen him. They embittered Job by false suspicions. Elihu confines himself only to the facts known to all concerned." For if the assertions attributed to Job in ^{9} are true, they are not sinful; and if not true, their falsehood is due to Job's conduct before his sufferings befell him. As a matter of fact, ^{9} is not a true statement of Job's point of view: he had never claimed immunity from all sin; on the contrary, had recognized that he, like all men, had not been free from sin (7^{21} 13^{26}, cp. 10^{6}). What he had maintained was his integrity (1^{1} n.), that he was not contumaciously wicked, that he was in the right ($9^{21f.}$ 10^{7} 13^{18} 16^{17} $23^{7.\ 10-12}$ 27^{4-6} 31) in the issue which, on the current theory, was being decided against him by the very fact of his sufferings: in other words, that he belonged to the class of those whose whole soul was set against the sins to which human nature is prone and devoted to the ways of God, and to whom accordingly, on the current theory, prosperity was due. Why these unparalleled sufferings? Not, Job had asserted, because I had so sinned as to deserve

9 “Pure am I, without transgression ;
  Clean, and I have no iniquity (in me):
10 Behold, he findeth ⌜pretexts⌝ against me,
  He holdeth me for his enemy.
11 He putteth my feet in the stocks,
  He marketh all my ways.”
12 Behold, herein thou art not in the right‸;
  For God is greater than man.
13 Wherefore contendest thou with him (saying),
  “He answereth none of ⌜my⌝ words”?

---

them; yes, the friends had been driven to say, inventing sins in Job's past life to justify their answer because your sins had deserved them: yes, Elihu seems to say all irrelevantly, because no man is without sin: neither are you.

9. Not an exact quotation: see on ^{8}.—*Pure*] in reference to Job (8^{6}, Bildad; 11^{4} Ṣophar); to Job's prayer 16^{17} (Job); to the heavens (15^{15}, Eliphaz); the stars (25^{5}, Bildad). The parallel term *clean* is peculiar to Elihu.

10a. Cp. $10^{13\text{-}17}$; ^{b} is, allowing for the necessary change of persons, an exact quotation of 13^{24}: cp. also 19^{11} 30^{21}.—*Pretexts*] for picking a quarrel with me: 𝕸 *frustrations*: see phil. n.

11. = 13^{27}.

12. In consequence, probably of corruption of the text, the exact point of the v. is uncertain. In ^{a} 𝕲 reads, For how sayest thou, I am in the right, and (yet) he answereth me not. For this and some attempts to emend the text—none of them quite satisfactory, see phil. n.—*Herein*] in the statements just cited in $^{9\text{-}11}$.—*In the right*] 𝕸 + *I (will) answer thee*.—*For God is greater than man*] “and consequently above all arbitrary, unreasoning hostility” (Du.); or the meaning may be: greater than and so unaccountable to men. 𝕲 represents a very different text, which, though not so understood by 𝕲, might have meant: for God hideth Himself from men (cp. $9^{11f.}$).

13. Why quarrel with God? the reason you allege, that He does not answer you, is false; He does answer, ^{14}.—*My words*] 𝕸 *his words*: if this were right, the pronoun would refer directly to man (^{12b}), in general, and only implicitly to Job.

14 For God speaketh in one way,
And in two, without (man's) perceiving it:—
15 In dream, in vision of the night,
When deep sleep falleth upon men,
During hours of slumber in (their) bed;
16 Then he uncovereth the ear of men,
And dismayeth them with admonishments (?);

---

14. God speaks in more ways than one, by dreams, sufferings, etc., and men fail to recognize the fact—not, of course, always (for see [17ff.]), but often; Elihu is content to omit the qualification, because the general law is exemplified by Job, whom he has particularly in view. In view of the general terms of [15ff.], it is doubtful whether we ought to make [14] specific in form, as it is in implication, by reading "without *thy* perceiving it."—*In one way . . . in two ways*] *i.e.* in several ways (see phil. n.).

15–18. First illustration of the ways in which God speaks. He speaks to men, as He had spoken (cp. 7^{14}) to Job in particular, by means of dreams with the immediate aim of deflecting them from their evil courses [17], and the ultimate aim [18] of saving them from the evil fate to which their courses would lead.

15. *Dream, vision of the night*] cp., in parallelism, 20^{8}; so in the pl. "dreams" ‖ "visions," 7^{14}.—b. = 4^{13b}: see nn there.—*Hours of slumber*] Hebr. *slumberings*; the pl. as in Pr. 6^{10} (a few moments, or snatches, of slumber; ct. the sing. in [4]).

16. *Uncovereth the ear of*] *i.e.* imparts a communication to; the phrase is used of a man revealing a purpose or secret to another (1 S. 20^{2}, Ru. 4^{4}), especially one that closely concerns the person whose ear is "uncovered" (1 S. 20^{12} $22^{8.17}$); and then of God's imparting to man a promise (2 S. 7^{27}), warning (here, $36^{10.15}$) or direction (1 S. 9^{15}).—b. A very ambiguous line (see phil. n.). Even 𝔐 seems to admit, and indeed to suggest, two different renderings: (1) And he sealeth their fetter, *i.e.* strengthens the bond that binds them to God—very improbable; or, (2) he sealeth their instruction, which has been interpreted in several ways (see Di.); *e.g.*: (*a*) "puts the seal to, or con-

17 In order to turn mankind aside ⌜from his⌝ (evil) work,
And to ⌜cut away⌝ pride from man;
18 To keep back his soul from the pit,
And his life from passing away through (God's) missiles.
19 He is also disciplined with pain upon his bed,
While the strife of his bones is perennial;

---

firms, their moral education" (Dr.); or (*b*) imparts instruction to them under seal, *i.e.* secretly (Ges. *Thes.* 538*a*): this would correspond admirably to the sense of the parallel, but it is doubtful whether the Hebrew naturally expresses it. With a change of punctuation, 𝔐 may also be rendered as above, though Di. in criticism of it remarks, not altogether without force, that admonishments are not the means to create dismay, nor is dismay the purpose of admonishment; this criticism can be obviated by taking a suggestion from 𝔊, and rendering: And dismayeth them with what they see (במראים): by night God suggests to men words [a] of counsel, and brings before them [b] visions of their fate (cp. [18]), if they persist in sin (cp. [17]). This reading would connect [15f.] even more strikingly with 7^{14}: Job there refers to visions sent by God which scared him; but they had not, in Elihu's view, turned Job from his sin.

17 f. Cp. $36^{10\text{-}12}$. For the emendations adopted above, see phil. n. Pride, according to Bu., is specially mentioned (cp. 36^{9}) as, in Elihu's view, Job's besetting sin, but see Introd. § 41. 𝔐 can be rendered, but only in such ways as at once indicate the improbability of its correctness: *e.g.* that mankind may put away work, and hide pride from man (cp. RVm.); or, that mankind may put away work and pride from man, who hides (both: Hoffm.). Ehrlich, with no more extensive alterations than those adopted above, renders: Hiding from mankind his work, and concealing (his) majesty from man.

18. *The pit*] 17^{14} n.—*Passing away through* (*God's*) *missiles*] *i.e.* perishing owing to the divine retribution for persistent sin overtaking him; or, *passing on into missiles*, *i.e.* rushing unconsciously to their fate; or, emending, *passing on into Sheol*: see phil. n.

19. Secondly, God speaks to men through the discipline

[20] His appetite abhorreth food,
And his soul dainties.
[21] His flesh wasteth away so that it cannot be seen,
And his bones . . .
[22] And so his soul draweth near to the pit,
And his life to the slayers.

---

of pain and sickness (cp. Ps. 38^{4}): all Job's pains, if Job but understood it, are words of God admonishing him. Eliphaz had said the same ($5^{17f.}$); "Elihu's originality is confined to a long-winded description of suffering" (Du.).—*The strife of his bones*] fig. for racking pains. On the alternative reading, "the multitude of his bones," and emendations, see phil. n.—*Perennial*] see phil. n. on 12^{19}.

20. Sickness produces nausea, so that, though hungry, the sick man finds even favourite foods disgusting: see phil. n.

21. *His flesh wasteth away*] cp. Pr. 5^{11} "at thy latter end, when thy flesh and thy body waste away"; Ps. 73^{26}. The vb. is used with other subjects in 7^{9} (of a *vanishing* cloud compared with man's vanishing in death), 7^{6} (of the days of a man's life), 11^{20} (of the eyes), 19^{27} (of the reins).—*So that it cannot be seen*] if legitimate, the rendering, *so that it is not* (any longer) *sightly*, would be preferable; but see phil. n.—*His bones . . .*] the words left untranslated are very questionable. The line has commonly been rendered and interpreted, *And his bones, which were* (formerly) *not seen* (because then covered with flesh) *are* (now that they are denuded of flesh [a], laid) *bare*; improbable: see phil. n.

22. *The slayers*] the only allusion (for 2 S. 24^{16}, Ps. 78^{49} are not strict parallels), itself not absolutely certain (see phil. n.), in the OT., to the angels of death, who take the soul of the dying man to its place in Sheol. These play a considerable part in later Jewish literature; so first in Test. Asher 6^{4}, "For the latter ends of men do show their righteousness (or unrighteousness), when they meet (so read with Charles) the angels of the Lord and of Satan"; and later the idea was elaborated, see, e.g., *Kethuboth*, 104[a]: "When a wicked man is destroyed, three bands of destroying angels meet him; one cries, No peace, saith God, for the wicked; another, Ye shall

23 If (now) there be for him an angel,
An interpreter, one of a thousand,
To declare unto man what is right for him;

---

lie down in pain; and a third, Go down and lie with the uncircumcized." See, further, Charles's n. on Test. Asher 6^4: Bousset, *Die Religion des Judenthums*, 284 f.

23–28. But in the very article of death (^{22}), an angel may visit the sick man, and interpret to him what God had been saying to him through his sufferings (^{23}), viz. that he had sinned; if the sick man acknowledges his sin and repents, then he is brought back from death's door to complete health ($^{24f.}$). On his recovery the man publicly recites in song how he had sinned and been saved ($^{26-28}$). The general sense, so far, of the vv. is clear; owing probably to more or less mutilation of the text, several details are obscure.

23 f. The verses are irregular in form, probably as a result of the loss, and, perhaps, also of the addition of words: see phil. n.

23. *If*] Du. reads אז, *then* (there is for him, etc.), on the ground that Elihu's theory is futile, if it is a mere accident whether God sends an angel, and so saves the sick man.—*For him*] working for the good of the sick man (see phil. n.); Hi. Wr. *beside* (cp. 1 K. 22^{19}) *him*, viz. God; but this is equally improbable, whether we continue in ^{c} "to declare unto man (God's) uprightness" (Hi.), or "to proclaim on man's behalf his (man's) uprightness" (Wr.).—*An interpreter*] of angels intermediating between God and man 5^1 appears to speak (see n. there); here, as the context indicates, the function of this special class of angels was to interpret to men, as it were, the foreign and unintelligible language (Gn. 42^{23}) of God's dealings with them. As. Du. well points out, the angel here performs the same function as, in earlier stories, was discharged by prophets (Is. 38); and it is to prophets or the like that the same term "interpreters" is applied in Is. 43^{27}.—*One of a thousand*] No sick man need fear that there are not enough angels deputed for this service to serve all needs, for angels with this one duty of interpreting numbered thousand(s): angels of all classes numbered myriads (Dn. 7^{10}).—*What is*

24 And (if) he be gracious and say,
"Release him from going down to the pit;
I have found a ransom [for his life]";
25 His flesh becometh fresh with youth,
He returneth to the days of his lustihood;

---

right for him] 𝔊 *his fault*: Du. *his discipline*, *i.e.* the meaning of it. In 𝔊 a line parallel to 23c follows: And to bring him to a knowledge of his sins; this may have formed part of the original text; see phil. n. on 23–25.

24. *And if he be gracious*] much less probably, *then he is gracious* (RV.), since 23 by itself much less clearly even than 23f indicates that the sick man has recognized his sin—the condition of favour being shown to him. The subj. is the interpreting angel, who now addresses a particular angel of death (22) who was on the point of carrying off the sick man to Sheol, a situation which foreshadows the later highly developed doctrine of opposed types of angels interested in the death of men: cp. also Michael's contention with Satan over the body of Moses, Jude 9. Others take God as the subj., on the ground (Di.) that the right of showing favour and receiving ransom does not belong to the angel; and certainly, if it is not to the "slayer," it must be to God that the ransom is ultimately paid (cp. the illuminating parallel in Ps. 49 8–10 (7–9)); yet the angel may speak as God's agent.—*Ransom*] *kopher*, the price paid in lieu of forfeiting life (Ex. 21 30). The whole sentence implies that the sick man has confessed and repented, even though we need not with Di. Dr. say that the ransom is the repentance.

25. If the angel succeeds in his purpose of bringing the sick man to repentance, 23f., then he renews his youth. Du., who eliminates the hypothetical in 23, takes this v. (rendering, *let his flesh become . . . let him return*) as continuing the words spoken by the interpreting angel to the angel of death.—*With youth*] or, *more than in youth*: or (𝔊), *as that of a youth*.

26. Being recovered from his sickness, the man (makes a solemn visit to the Temple, offers sacrifice and) prays to God acceptably; such are probably the implications of the v.; cp. the similar passage in Eliphaz's speech (22 27), "Thou shalt entreat him (God), and he will hear thee, And thou shalt pay thy vows."

26 He entreateth God and he is favourable to him,
And he seeth his face with (the sound of Temple) music;
And he ⌜proclaimeth⌝ his righteousness unto man,
27 He singeth unto men, and saith,

—*He seeth his face*] the alternative rendering of 𝕳, He (God) lets (him) see His face, would be against the analogy of 22^{27b}. The meaning is rather: he (the man restored to health) sees His (God's) face, *i.e.* visits the temple (cp. 22^{27b}), and makes an offering for his recovery: cp., Thou shalt not see my face empty handed (Ex. 23^{15} 34^{20}); see also Is. 1^{12} (with n. there). Other terms in the v. are also probably used with special reference to the cultus; thus, the vb. *to be favourable* (to a person: רצה) is predicated of God frequently, though not exclusively, in connection with sacrifices: cp. 2 S. 24^{25}, Hos. 8^{13}, Jer. 14^{12}, Ezk. $20^{40. 41}$ 43^{27}; cp. also the recurrent phrase לרצון in connection with sacrifices (*e.g.* Lv. 1^{3}, Is. 60^{7}). The last phrase of the v. might mean simply: with shouts of joy, the noun (תרועה) being used as in 8^{21} (‖ שחוק); but perhaps it refers to the joyous sounds or music that accompanied ritual acts; cp. Ps. 33^{3} 47^{6} and especially Ps. 27^{6}, (107^{22}), "sacrifices of תרועה," *i.e.* accompanied by music. Others, however, interpret 26b of admission in a spiritual sense to God's presence (so Dr.); then cp. Ps. 11^{7}.

26c, 27, 28. The man not only prays to God (26a) in the Temple, but there also he makes public (27a) confession of sin (27b) which caused his sickness, and of God's goodness in not dealing with him according to his deserts (27c), but, instead, bringing him back from death's door (28a), and allowing him once again to enjoy health (28b).

26c. *He proclaims his righteousness*] *i.e.* the sick man proclaims God's "righteousness," as shown, namely, in His faithfulness in restoring the penitent to health; cp. Ps. $40^{10f.}$, and also Ps. $22^{23. 32 (22. 31)}$ 35^{18}. Thus emended the line becomes an admirable parallel to 27a. 𝕳 must be rendered: *He* (God) *restoreth unto man his* (man's) *righteousness*, *i.e.* looks upon him again as righteous; but, besides involving an awkward change of subject from 26b, this is really a *hysteron proteron*; for the

"I sinned, and made crooked that which was straight,
Yet he requited me not ⌜according to my iniquity⌝;
28 He redeemed my soul from passing on to the pit,
And my life (now) seeth its fill of the light."

---

sick man is already again treated as righteous when his health returns to him (25).

27. *He singeth unto*] 𝔐 probably intends *he looketh upon* (RVm.), which is quite inappropriate. It is difficult, as Du. remarks, to see how otherwise the convalescent could publicly sing such a psalm of confession and thanksgiving as follows in 27b. c. 28 than by means of the Temple services; when a man presented a thank-offering (תודה) for recovery, the Temple singers may have sung on the man's behalf an appropriate psalm appointed for such purposes; we may compare the title to Ps. 100 "for (an offering of) thanksgiving" (לתודה; cp. Lv. $7^{11f.}$), though this psalm is not suited for the thanksgiving in particular of a convalescent, and the custom attested in the Mishnah of appointing Psalms to be recited by the Levites in connection with the offerings made by groups of individuals, *e.g.* Ps. 30, when the inhabitants of a particular district presented firstfruits at the temple (Ber. iii.: see *Numbers*, p. 228). For the close association of *t*e*ru*ʿ*ah* (26b) and Temple-singing, cp. Ps. 27^6, "I will sacrifice in his tent sacrifices of *t*e*ru*ʿ*ah*, I will sing and make melody unto Yahweh."—*Made crooked that which was straight*] cp. Mic. 3^9 (with a synonymous vb. עקש, here העויתי), "who abhor right, and make crooked all that is straight, building up Jerusalem with blood," etc.; cp. also (with עוה as here) "he (God) hath made crooked my ways," Lam. 3^9: "they have made their way crooked," Jer. 3^{21}; and with עקש) Is. 59^8, "the way of peace they know not, and right is not in their paths, their tracks they have made crooked," Pr. 10^9.—27c. see phil. n.

28. *From passing on*] v.18b.—*The pit*] 18a: see phil. n.—*Seeth its fill of*] or *has pleasure in the sight of*, the expressive idiom used so often in the psalms and commonly rendered "to see one's pleasure on."—*The light*] as in $3^{16.\ 20}$, the light of day, or, as 30 calls it, "of life," contrasted tacitly with Sheol, to which the sick man had drawn sufficiently near to be involved in its darkness.

29 Lo, all these things God doeth,
Twice, thrice with man,
30 To bring back his soul from the pit,
That he might ⌜see his fill of⌝ the light of life.
31 Give heed, Job; hearken to me;
Keep silence, and *I* will speak.
32 If thou *hast* ought to say, answer me;
Speak, for I desire to pronounce thee innocent,
33 If not, do *thou* listen to me,
Keep silence, and I will teach thee wisdom.
XXXIV. 1 And Elihu answered and said,

---

29. God repeatedly applies the methods just described ($^{8-30}$), chastisements, dreams, angelic messengers.—*Twice, thrice*] 5^{19} n.

30. *See his fill of*] cp.^{28}. 𝔐 has been rather questionably taken to mean *enlighten* (*him*) *with*, or, still more questionably, *be enlightened with*: see phil. n.—*Light of life*] the parallel terms of 3^{20} are here combined into a genitival phrase.

31–33. Elihu invites Job to listen to further wisdom from his lips ($^{31.\ 33}$), unless (^{32}) he has any words ready with which to reply to what Elihu has just said. To reduce Elihu's wordiness, Bu. omits ^{33}; 𝔊 improved Elihu even more thoroughly by omitting $^{31b-33}$. With ^{32}, cp. ^{6}.

XXXIV. 1. Cp. 35^{1}, and see above, p. 277.

2–37. The second part of Elihu's refutation of Job. In the first part (33^{8-30}) Elihu, though he cited (33^{9}) Job's assertion of innocence, actually confined himself to meeting Job's complaint that God does not speak to him: here, once again (cp. 33^{9-11} 35^{3}) summarizing Job's assertions ($^{5f.\ 9}$), he takes up Job's claim to be righteous, with its corollary that God is the subverter of right, and, addressing himself at first ($^{2-15}$) to the wise ($^{2.\ 10}$), and then ($^{16-37}$: note the 2nd p. sing. $^{16f.\ 33}$) to Job, replies that Job is wicked ($^{7f.}$), that God is not a subverter of right ($^{10-12}$), nor can be, for He is beyond question ($^{13.\ 29-32}$) and supreme, unerring in the observation and unfailing in the punishment of wickedness ($^{14-28}$): he concludes with the opinion of the wise, that Job speaks foolishly in multiplying his wicked words against God ($^{34-37}$).

2–4. Let the wise, exercising their power of intellectual and

2 Hear, ye wise, my words,
And ye that have knowledge, give ear to me;
3 For the ear testeth words,
As the palate tasteth ⸢food⸣.
4 What is right, let us choose for ourselves;
Let us know among ourselves what is good.
5 For Job hath said, "I am righteous,
And it is God who hath taken away my right;
6 Notwithstanding my right, I am ⸢in pain⸣!
My arrow(-wound) is incurable, though I am without transgression."
7 Who is a man like Job,
Who drinketh up scorning like water,
8 And taketh his path to associate with workers of naughtiness,
And to go with men of wickedness?

---

moral taste or discrimination ($^{3} = 12^{11}$ Job) *choose* (cp. Is. 7^{16}) or discriminate what is right and *good* (Is. 7^{16}) over against Job's blasphemous assertions.

2. *Ye wise*] not the three friends (Bu.), for the tone of reproof used in addressing the latter ($32^{7ff.}$) is no longer present, but a wider circle of wise men whom the author either pictures as gathered together to consider Job's case, or addresses by a literary convention (cp. "my son" in Proverbs).

5 f. Elihu in part cites ($^{5b} = 27^{2}$), in part summarizes Job's position; cp. $9^{15.\,20}$ 10^{7a}.

6. *I am in pain*] 𝔐 *I am to lie*, which is supposed to mean I am to be accounted a liar when I maintain that right is on my side; see phil. n.—*My arrow(-wound)*] the wound inflicted by God's arrows (6^{4}).

7. Cp. 15^{16} (Eliphaz) "a man that drinketh up *iniquity* like water"; Elihu specifies derisive speech about God as one of Job's sins, and gives (as Eliphaz, $22^{13f.}$, before him) a specimen in ^{9}; but Elihu does not *limit* his charges against Job to sins of speech (Bu.); the terms in ^{8} (און רשע) are as wide as that in 15^{16b} (עולה).—*Scorning*] לעג, like the synonymous term (לצים) in Ps. 1^{2}, of scornful speech about God.

8. Cp. 22^{15} (Eliphaz). Elihu depicts Job as a man making a practice of selecting a path in which he could be sure of companions in wickedness.

9 For he hath said, "A man profiteth not
By being well pleased with God."
10 Therefore, [ye wise, give heed];
Ye men of understanding, hearken to me.
Far be it from God to do wickedness,
And from the Almighty to do unrighteously.
11 For the work of man he repayeth unto him,
And as (is) the path of each (such is what) he causes to befall him.
12 Yea, surely, *God* doth not do wickedly,
And the *Almighty* doth not pervert right.
13 Who entrusted to him the earth?
And who hath laid ⌜upon him⌝ the whole world?

---

9. The citation again is not exact (cp. on [5f.]); but cp. $9^{22.\ 30f.}$ 10^3 $21^{7ff.}$. An exacter parallel outside Job is Mal. $3^{13.\ 14}$. In 35^3 Elihu substantially repeats his present charge, and then (not in this c.) proceeds to refute it; on this ground and because it comes in lamely here, Bu. rejects the present v.; note also the occurrence of *'lohim* (see p. 232 n.).

10. *Ye wise, give heed*] see phil. n. For *wise* and *men of understanding* (Heb. *heart*: 7^{17} n.), see [34]; cp. [2]. Bi. Bu. Nichols om. $10^{a.\ b}$.—c. d. Cp. 8^3 (Bildad).—*To do unrighteously*] 𝔊 *to pervert justice*, as in 8^3: see phil. n.

11. So far from perverting justice ([10. 12]) by granting to the wicked prosperity and to the righteous adversity, God scrupulously and exactly makes a man's lot in life correspond to his deeds [a], and path of life, *i.e.* his conduct [b].—Elihu here contradicts in general terms, as Bildad (8^4) had contradicted in particular terms by reference to Job's children, the assertion ([10] 8^3) that God makes men suffer beyond their deserts.—a. The same principle is frequently stated in similar terms: see Is. 3^{11}, Pr. 12^{14b} 19^{17}, Ps. 28^4.—b. Lit., And the likeness of the path of a man (איש) he causeth to find him: on the idiom, see phil. n. Job's sufferings correspond to the wicked path ([8]) he had habitually followed.

12. Cp. [10] and 8^3.

13. God does not do wickedly ([12]); for ([13]) He rules the earth, not as the deputy of someone else (cp. 36^{23a}), but as supreme and answerable to none: consequently no one can call Him to account, and say to Him (36^{23b}), Thou hast done wickedly:

14 If he were ⌜to cause his spirit to return⌝ to himself,
    And were to gather unto himself his breath;
15 All flesh would expire together,
    And man would return unto the dust.

16 And if ⌜thou hast⌝ understanding, hear this;
    Give ear to the voice of my words.
17 *Can* one that hateth right govern?
    And wilt thou pronounce wicked the mighty just one?

---

consequently again He cannot do wickedly. Such seems to be the line of argument underlying the v., the idea of God's supremacy being further enforced in $^{14f.}$ God may call the "sons of the gods" to account for unjust administration (Ps. 82), but the "sons of the gods," and still less men, have neither right nor power to call God to account: He can do no wrong.—*Hath laid upon him*] though uncertain, this rendering is preferable to the alternatives *disposed* (RV.), *founded* (*i.e.* at creation), *observed*, *attended to* (see phil. n.); for all these are open to the objections (1) that, whereas the first line expects the answer: No one, the second would require the answer: No one but He; and (2) so interpreted, would obscure the line of thought suggested by ^{a}.

14 f. All human life is absolutely dependent on God, who creates human life by imparting spirit and breath (Gn. 2^{7}, Is. 42^{5}, Ps. 104^{29}), and ends it by withdrawing (Ps. 104^{29}, Eccl. 12^{7}) these. God could, if He wished, demonstrate His supremacy by depriving every living thing of life in a single moment. Whether the further thought is present, that man's still living on proves God's benevolent care (Peake), or freedom from unrighteousness (cp. Bu. Di.), is doubtful. With the phraseology here cp. particularly Ps. 104^{29}: "He gathereth their breath, they expire, and return unto their dust": Eccl. 12^{7}, "the spirit returneth unto God." The spirit of life in man may be described either as man's spirit from its residing in man during life (so Ps. 104^{29}), or as God's spirit from its originating with Him (here, Ps. 104^{30}). On the text translated above, and on 𝔐 (quite illegitimately translated in RV. ^{14a}), see phil. n.

16. Elihu turns from the wider audience ($^{1-15}$) to address Job in particular.

18 Him who saith to a king, "Thou scoundrel"!
And to nobles, "Ye wicked";
19 Who showeth not partiality to princes,
Nor regardeth the opulent above the poor?

---

17. The point of the question appears to be: God actually governs, and is *ipso facto* a lover and securer of right within His dominion; for, [a] hatred and rejection of right brings government to naught: injustice and government are incompatible; similarly, [b] God is the mighty just one: therefore He is not unjust, and you must not say that He is. Since whether the government of God and perversion of right, God and injustice are incompatibles, is the question that Job has raised, Elihu's questions imply assertions which, as Du. (cp. Peake) well points out, are really a *petitio principii*.

18. Develops and expands the idea of "the mighty just one" in ^{17}: God is not deflected from the path of equity by the fear or favour of the great ones of the earth; as their maker (^{19c}) He is immeasurably mightier than they; kings and princes no less than the poorest of mankind, if they are wicked, He calls and treats as such; men may, and too often do (Is. 32^{5}), call wicked men in high places good: not so God. On the indefensible interpretation of 𝔐 followed by EVV. see phil. n. —*Scoundrel*] Heb. *b^eliyya'al*, *belial*, the term used of various forms of contemptible or outrageous conduct, such as contemptible niggardliness (Dt. 15^{9}, 1 S. 25^{25} 30^{22}), outrageous sexual offence (Jg. 19^{22}), professional perjury (1 K. 21^{10}; cp. Pr. 19^{28}); here it is best taken widely as implying any form of peculiarly heinous wickedness.

19c, 20a. The reason why God does not excuse wickedness in the rich and powerful is (^{19c}) that they are His creatures with whom He has no cause to curry favour, and the proof (^{20a}) that they are wicked is the fact that such persons die suddenly. But this is awkwardly expressed, and the form of the distich is suspicious: see phil. n.—*At midnight*] death steals upon them when they are not expecting it: cp. $27^{19f.}$, Jer. 49^{9}, 1 Thess. 5^{2}, Lk. 12^{20}.

20b. c. 𝔐 is corrupt, and the emended text not certain; see phil. n.—*The opulent*] v.^{19b}; 𝔐 (*the*) *people*.—*Smitten*] of

For the work of his hands are they all;
20 In a moment they die and at midnight:
The ⌈opulent⌉ are ⌈smitten⌉, and pass away,
And the mighty are removed without hand.
21 For his eyes are on the ways of a man,
And all his steps he seeth.
22 There is no darkness, and there is no thick gloom,
For the workers of iniquity therein to hide themselves.
23 For not for a man doth he appoint a ⌈stated time⌉,
That he should go before God in judgment.
24 He breaketh in pieces mighty men without investigation,
And setteth others in their place.
25 Therefore he knoweth their works,
And overturneth (them) in the night so that they are crushed.

God ‖ to "without (human) hand" in °, the vb. being the pass. (Ps. 73^{5}) of that used in 1^{11} (n.) 19^{21}: 𝔐 *shaken violently.—Without hand*] mysteriously, not by the hand of men, but by God: see phil. n.

21 f. As God allows no sinner, however powerful, to escape through fear of Him $^{18f.}$, so He never, through limitation of knowledge, fails to observe and punish sin: He is omniscient. Cp. $22^{13f.}$, where Eliphaz misrepresents Job, who, no less than the friends, admits (31^{4}) the omniscience of God, but draws the different conclusion that He must therefore be aware of his innocence (10^{7}).

22. Ps. $139^{11f.}$; Jer. 23^{24}.

23 f. The punishment of God descends on man in a moment (^{20}); for, being omniscient ($^{21f.}$), He has no need to be hindered by "law's delays"; unlike a human judge, He appoints no future day for the hearing of the case, nor has any need to carry on a lengthy and laborious investigation of it. The words seem to be directed against the wish which Job has expressed that the case between God and himself might be heard, and that the *reason* of God's treatment should thus be revealed ($23^{3ff.}$), though he has anticipated Elihu in pointing out that as a matter of fact God and man do not meet at a tribunal ($9^{32f.}$).—*For . . . a stated time*] 𝔐 is most simply rendered: *for of a man he takes no further notice*; against this and other renderings of 𝔐, see phil. n.

26 [His wrath] shattereth the wicked,
He slappeth them in the place of (all) beholders.
27 Forasmuch as they turned aside from following him,
And heeded none of his ways,
28 That they might cause the cry of the poor to come unto him,
And that he might hear the cry of the needy.
29 And if he giveth quiet, who then can condemn?
And if he hide the face, who then can behold him?
. . . .
30 . . . .
31 For unto God hath one (ever) said, " . . .
. . . .
32 . . . do thou teach me:
If I have done iniquity, I will do it no more."
33 According to *thy* judgment, . . . ?
For thou must choose, and not I;
And what thou knowest, speak.

---

25. If the v. is in place (Du. om. [25], Bu. [25-28]; see also phil. n. on [26]), and rightly read, *therefore*, as in Is. 26^{14}, does not denote consequence, but develops what is implicit in what precedes, here in [23f.] (*Lex.* 487*a*).

26a. 𝔐, unsuitably: instead of the wicked he slappeth them, etc. See, further, phil. n.

28. *That they might*] the consequence being represented as the intention: cp. *e.g.* Am. 2^7, Jer. 7^{18} (Lex. *s.v.* למען; cp. 775*b*).

29–33. These verses are as a whole unintelligible, the details being, if not unintelligible, then (as in [29]) very ambiguous, and the ambiguities, in face of the extreme uncertainty of the remainder, insoluble. In addition to its unintelligibility, the formlessness of much ([29c. 30. 31. 33]) of the passage points to considerable corruption of the text. By the help of emendations, necessarily conjectural, for 𝔊 omits the vv. and the other VV. give no help, or by forced and utterly improbable interpretations of the existing text, translations have been attempted, but none, at least of [29c-32a] is sufficiently probable to be reproduced above. One or two alternatives may be given here; discussion of further details may be found in the phil. nn. Without emendation, and without attempting to make individual clauses more intelligible in English than they are in

𝔐, the vv. may be rendered: [29] And (if) he is (or, giveth) quiet, who, then, can condemn? And (if) he hide the face, who, then, can behold him? Both upon (or, toward, or against) a nation, and upon (or against) man together; [30] That the godless men reign not, That (there be) no snares of the people. [31] For unto God hath one said, I have borne, I will not offend (or, without offending); [32] Beyond (that which) I see, do *thou* teach me: if I have done iniquity, I will do it no more. [33] According to *thy* judgment, will he repay it? that (or because) thou hast refused it. For (or, that) thou shouldest choose, and not I: and what thou knowest, speak. If this strangely expressed passage was really written originally as it now stands, it might, perhaps, with least improbability be explained (cp. Dr. in the *Book of Job*) as follows:—[29] When God gives respite from tyrannical rule, who can condemn Him for indifference or injustice? and when He hides His face from the deposed tyrants, which of them can recover His favour? In acting as these questions suggest, God keeps in view alike the interests of the individual and of the nation, [30] preventing godless men from continuing to reign and from alluring the people to ruin. This point of view must be put, [31] for Job has spoken as no one ever had done before him, asserting that he had suffered, though he had committed no offence, [32] insisting that God should show him the sins he knows not of, and saying that *if* he has sinned (but not admitting that he has done so), he will do so no more. [33] Elihu is satisfied with God's system of recompence: Job is not, but insists on one according to his judgment of what is fitting: it is for Job then, and not for Elihu, to choose what this alternative system of recompence shall be: let Job say what it is. Apart from minuter details, the chief difference among those who attempt to interpret the text as it stands, or as it has been variously emended, turns on the ambiguity of [29], and on the nature of the speech in [31b. 32]. According to an alternative interpretation, [29] refers to the (seeming) inactivity of God; even when God, in spite of cries for help ([28]) directed to him, keeps quiet and hides his face so as not to give the help asked for, as many psalms show that he frequently seemed to do, man must not criticize, as Job has done (Du.). The

34 Men of understanding will say to me,
And (every) wise man that heareth me,
35 "Job doth not speak with knowledge,
Nor are his words (uttered) with discretion.
36 Would that Job were tried unto the end,
Because of (his) answers like those of wicked men."

---

speech in [31b. 32] has not only been understood as above, but (1) as containing a genuine and penitent confession of sin which certainly seems to be the most natural way to take [32b], the least suspicious and ambiguous line in the whole passage (Bu.); then, if [31a] be left unemended, Elihu implies that Job has never made such a confession ("for unto God hath he ever said? no, never"); or, if [31a] be emended, it is (reading אֱמֹר for האמר) an exhortation to Job to make such a confession, or (reading לְהֶאָמֵר) a statement of what is the fitting course to take when God seems inactive in the face of appeals for help; or, (2) [31. 32] has been taken hypothetically, the virtual protasis beginning with [32] (Du.). [31] If unto God one hath said . . . [33] on thy account must he repay it? In c. 21, Job had demanded the punishment of the godless as the price of his believing that the government of the world is moral, but if, says Elihu on this interpretation, the godless makes a penitent confession, must God still punish him in order that you may believe? This, too, involves emendation, and even the emended text states the hypothesis in an extraordinary manner (see phil. n.).

34. All wise (cp. [2a]) and intelligent (cp. [10a]) men must agree with Elihu, that Job's wicked words against God display ignorance and lack of insight.

35 f. The text is again uncertain; but as Job is clearly referred to in the third person (ct. [16. 33]), it is better to take the vv. as continuing the citation of the opinion of the wise men begun in [35]: the opinion cited is that which Elihu assumes must be that of those ([2]) for whom he had summarized in [5f.] Job's words. If the opening word of [36] (אבי) really meant *I would that*, and retained its force, the words of the wise would be confined to [35], and with [36] Elihu would resume.

36. *Tried*] cp. 7^{18}.—*Unto the end*] *i.e.* till he ceases from his wicked answers. But the sense of [36] may have been rather

37 "For he addeth unto his sin rebellion,
Among us he slappeth (his hands),
And multiplieth his words against God."

---

different; an emended text (see phil. n.) would read, But would that Job would let himself be warned for ever, And let him not class himself among wicked men.

37. *He addeth unto his sin rebellion*] *i.e.* he persists in sinning, becoming even more contumacious as fresh opportunities arise. With the idiom cp. Is. 30[1], "to add sin unto sin"; 1 S. 12[19], "We have added unto all our sins what is bad in asking for ourselves a king," and the different though similarly constructed phrase in Jer. 45[3].—*Rebellion*] the term (פשע) often occurs as a mere synonym of other words for sin or iniquity; so ‖ to iniquity (עון), 7[21] 14[17] 31[33] 33[9]; to sin (חטאת) 13[23] and (חטא, vb.) 8[4] 35[6]; if so used here, the entire phrase "add to sin rebellion" is merely a variant on "add sin to sin." But the use of two different terms rather suggests that the second in contrast to the first is stronger; so in 8[4] 35[6] it stands, climactically perhaps, in the second line of the distich: yet in Ps. 32[1] it stands first. Such a climactic use of פשע as contrasted with חטאת would be in accordance with certain usages of the nouns or vbs.; the vb. פשע is used at times of political revolt or rebellion (*e.g.* 2 K. 1[1], 1 K. 12[19]), whereas חטאת starts from the less positive meaning of missing the mark (see phil. n. on 5[24]). Yet even if a difference is intended here, it is a difference in the intensity rather than in the character of the sin: it is very doubtful, therefore, whether "sin" refers in particular to Job's earlier conduct, assumed by Elihu as by Eliphaz in c. 22, to have been evil, and rebellion to his speeches against God (Di.: cp. Dr.). Even more probably if [36f.] belong to the speech of the wise men of [34], if "answers" in [36b] is the correct text, and if [37b] should be omitted, [37a] would refer rather (like its parallel [37c]) to Job's persistent and increasingly violent blasphemous speeches.

37b. The line is short and elliptical, and separates the two far more closely parallel lines [a] and [c]. It may be out of place. —*He slappeth his hands*] makes mocking gestures at God (cp. rather differently 27[23]).

XXXV. 1 And Elihu answered and said,
2 This thinkest thou to be right,
(And) sayest (of it), "My righteousness before God,"
3 That thou sayest, What advantage hast thou,
"Wherein am I better off than if I had sinned?"

XXXV. In this third part (cp. 33^8 34^2) of Elihu's refutation much is awkwardly expressed; and the argument is none too clearly articulated. Elihu starts afresh (cp. 34^9) with a summary of what he supposes Job to have maintained, viz. that righteousness does not pay ($^{2f.}$), and argues ($^{5-7}$) that God is too exalted to derive any benefit from Job's (or, implicitly, from any man's) righteousness, even if this were a reality. It is perhaps implied, though certainly not explicitly stated or even clearly indicated, that God accordingly is not, like human judges, deflected from the even course of justice by the receipt of bribes: consequently He does reward the righteous: and therefore righteousness pays. It is, then, only men who benefit by or suffer from the righteousness or wickedness of their fellow-men (^{8}); but men do so benefit or suffer, and so there are both wicked oppressors and victims of oppression (^{9}); these victims often cry to God for redress, and often, it is true, they are not heard (^{12}). This, however, is not because God is unjust, but because these very victims are not really religious ($^{10f.\ 13}$); and Job (though not the victim of oppression) is pre-eminently one of those who have not appealed to God in a truly religious spirit ($^{14-16}$).

2 f. Do you really think that you are placed in the right before God by your repeated (תאמר, freq.) assertions that man gets no advantage from being righteous?—*This*] viz. "that thou sayest," etc. (^{3}). On different views of the construction and translation of ^{2b}, see phil. n.

3. Cp. 34^9 with n. In ^{a} (hast) *thou* (= Job) is indirect narration; in ^{b} *I* (= Job) is direct; see phil. n. Richter takes the whole to be direct narration, so that thou in ^{a} = God, and Job's saying consists of two questions: What advantage does God get? (cp. 22^2). What advantage do I get? But this would probably have required more emphatic expression of the

4 *I* will answer thee,
    And thy friends with thee.
5 Look to the heavens, and see;
    And behold the skies—they are higher than thou.
6 If thou hast sinned, what achievest thou against him?
    And if thy transgressions be many, what doest thou unto him?
7 If thou be righteous, what givest thou to him?
    Or what from thy hand doth he receive?
8 A man like thyself thy wickedness (affects),
    And a son of man thy wickedness!
9 By reason of the multitude of oppressions men cry out;
    They call for help by reason of the arm of the ⌜mighty⌝;

---

pronouns than is found in 𝔐. Richter's view of the chapter is that Elihu is *refuting* the doctrine that religion is to be judged from the standpoint of utility; but though it is true that $^{6.7}$ deny that man's religion is useful to *God*, on the other hand $^{9-16}$ are anything but a denial of the utility of religion to *man*: the argument there is not that man gets no advantage from being religious, but that victims of oppression fail to get the help they cry for because they are not really religious; in other words, Elihu is attempting to harmonize certain obstinate facts with the eudæmonistic view of religion which he shares with the friends (cp. especially Eliphaz in c. 22), and with the Satan of the prologue; but which the author of the prologue repudiates, and from which in the dialogue he depicts Job emancipating himself.

4. *Thy friends*] the three friends (𝔊 Bu. Di. Du.) must be intended, not the wicked men of $34^{8.36}$ (Del. Da.) who would scarcely have been referred to by the term elsewhere used for the three friends (2^{11} 19^{21} and ? 32^{3}).

5–7. Elihu proceeds to "answer" Job and his friends by an appeal to the transcendence of God which places Him beyond receiving either hurt or help from man—a point already urged by Eliphaz ($22^{2f.}$) and admitted by Job (7^{20})!

5. God in heaven is beyond the reach of man: cp. 11^{7-9} (Ṣophar) 22^{12} (Eliphaz).

6 f. In substance a repetition of $22^{2f.}$ (Eliphaz): cp. 7^{20} (Job).

8, 9. See the introductory n. to this chapter.

10 And none had said, "Where is God my Maker,
Who giveth songs in the night:
11 Who teacheth us more than the beasts of the earth,
And maketh us wiser than the birds of the heaven."
12 There they cry out—but he answereth not—
Because of the pride of the wicked.

---

9. *Oppressions*] or, *oppressors*; see phil. n.—*Call for help*] cp. 24^{12}.—*Arm*] fig. for might: cp. $22^{8.\,9}$ n.

10, 11. The kind of confession which truly religious men, whether actually under oppression or not, ought to make, but which none of these victims (^{9}) of the violence of their fellow-men actually had made. Du. places ^{16} before ^{10}, rendering ^{10a}, And he (*i.e.* Job) said not. Possibly Elihu is actually citing some psalm; with ^{10b} cp. Ps. $42^{9\,(8)}$.—*And none had said, Where is*] all these victims had neglected to seek God: cp. in Jer. 2^{8}; the parallel clauses "said not, Where is Yahweh . . . knew me not . . . rebelled against me."—*My Maker*] cp. Ps. 95^{6}. As addressed to Job, the terms of the question are ill chosen; Job was not unmindful that God was his Maker; but the fact that He was such, so far from easing rather complicated the riddle of his sufferings ($10^{8ff.}$).—*Songs in the night*] the night is fig. for times of suffering and sorrow (cp. Is. 21^{11}, Ps. 30^{6}); in the very midst of distress, before the morning comes when His help would be more expected (cp. Ps. 46^{6} 90^{14} 143^{8}), God suddenly intervenes and by His deliverances gives occasion for songs (Ps. $77^{7\,(6)}$, Is. 24^{16}, Ps. 95^{2}).

11. *More than*] he teaches the beasts: not *from*, *by means of*, for the requirements of the present context are quite different from 12^{7}.

12. The v. is now most commonly (Ew. Di. Da. Del. Dr. Bu. Peake) taken as in the main resumptive of ^{9}—the oppressed cry out because of their treatment by those who are here called the wicked; the fresh point, viz. that God does not answer these oppressed persons, is, on this view, introduced parenthetically, the reason for their receiving no answer being suggested, though not formally expressed, in $^{10.\,11.\,13}$; they do not seek God or pray sincerely. This is certainly very awkward; and it is with a true instinct for what would be

13 Surely God doth not hear unreality,
Nor doth the Almighty behold it;
14 How much less when thou sayest (that) thou beholdest him not,
(That) the cause is before him, and thou waitest for him.

---

more natural that some (*e.g.* Hi.) have sought in ^{12b} the reason not for the cry, but for the cry remaining unheard: they are not answered because they are proud; on the other hand, to refer to the oppressed allusively as the wicked, when the oppressors have at least a better title to the term, is unnatural. For the *pride* of the wicked as the source of suffering to their fellow-men, cp. Ps. 10^{2}, Zeph. 2^{10}.

13. *Unreality*] "mere empty complaining (^{9}), not the voice of true religious trust ($^{10f.}$)," Dr.—*Behold*] favourably; cp. Hab. 1^{13}.

14–16. The connection is very obscure and uncertain; and the transition from the address to Job in ^{14} to the reference to him in the 3rd pers. in ^{16} is strange. This may be due to the loss or misplacement of entire lines or distichs. Taken by itself ^{16} is easy and straightforward, and the lines of ^{14} taken separately would present no great difficulty, but within ^{15} some mutilation of the text has occurred. Di. suspects the loss of two lines between ^{15a} and ^{b}: Du. places ^{16} between ^{8} and ^{10}, and takes ^{15} with 36^{2}. Nichols places $^{15f.}$ immediately after 34^{27} and immediately before 34^{24}. V.^{15} (in 𝔐 or as emended above) is neither satisfactorily taken as complete in itself, nor as completed by ^{16}. But the attempts to surmount these difficulties by further conjectural emendation or rearrangement are themselves too uncertain to be embodied in the above translation.

14. If God does not listen to those who call to Him without true religious feeling and resignation (^{13}), much less will He listen to Job who assumes a positively irreligious and complaining attitude.—*Thou beholdest him not*] summarizing such sayings of Job as 13^{24} $23^{8f.}$ 24^{1b} 30^{20}.—*That the cause,* etc.] ^{b}, unless emended, is most naturally taken (Di. RV.) as continuing, and parallel to, Job's words at the end of ^{a}: in this case the meaning is: Job's cause (cp. 13^{18} 23^{4}, but there משפט, here דין) lies unheeded before God, and Job waits in vain for God to give it attention. Less naturally the line has been taken as Elihu's

15 And now, because ⌜his anger visiteth not⌝,
And he careth not greatly about ⌜transgression⌝—
16 And Job openeth his mouth (to utter) emptiness;
Without knowledge he multiplieth words.

---

reply to Job's objection in [a]: Nay, if thou sayest that thou beholdest Him not, (I say in reply) the cause is before Him, *i.e.* is receiving His attention, and thou shouldst wait patiently for His decision; so RVm. Del. Bu. Emending Perl. Du. (cp. Peake) render, Be still before Him, and wait for Him, where the sense would indicate that the words are Elihu's reply.

15. In this v. too, taken by itself, and as it stands in 𝕳 or is emended above, it is most natural to take [b] as parallel to [a]. But there are two serious objections to so interpreting the v., if it states the cause of which [16] gives the effect: for (1) this would naturally imply that *Elihu* thought God inactive in the face of transgression, which he did not; and (2) it would give too secondary a reason for Job's speeches; he had, it is true, referred to the failure of God to punish the wicked (cc. 21, 24^{12}), but it is the sufferings of the righteous that are the primary cause of debate. These objections are only partly met by the less natural interpretation of the v., which has been adopted in order to avoid connecting [15] and [16] as cause and effect: according to this, [15] means: *And now because* (hitherto) *his anger has not visited* (the evil-doers in circumstances such as those described in [9ff.]), (You say) *he careth not much about transgression*: and so righteousness profits a man no more than sin ([2. 3]); [16] is then an independent statement closing the speech. Both these methods of interpretation are so unsatisfactory, that the probability of textual disorder is great. Du. (who places [16] before [10] and omits 36^{1}), treating [15] as exclamatory, and as the starting-point of a new division of Elihu's speech in which he does actually reply to the position assigned (implicitly) to Job in [15] (see $36^{6.\,9.\,12-14}$), interprets 35^{15} 36^{2} thus: And now (as for your further assertion) that His anger punishes nothing, and that He troubleth Himself not much about iniquity, wait for me a little, and I will show thee. For another attempt to surmount the difficulties of the connection by conjecture, see phil. n.

16. Cp. 34^{35}.

XXXVI. 1 And Elihu said further,
2 Wait for me a little, and I will declare to thee;
For ⌜I⌝ have yet words (to say) on behalf of God.
3 I will fetch my knowledge from afar,
And I will ascribe righteousness to my Maker.
4 For of a truth my words are not false;
He that is perfect in knowledge is with thee.

XXXVI. XXXVII. In this final section of his speech, Elihu, after briefly justifying his continuing to speak $^{2-4}$, maintains that God treats men severely or with favour according as they are righteous or unrighteous, $^{5-7}$, and more especially according to the temper in which they receive disciplinary suffering, $^{8-15}$; and Job, he points out, is viewing the fate of those who receive such suffering in the wrong temper, $^{16-21}$: he should rather (36^{24} 37^{14}) magnify God whose works are great, past finding out, or ($37^{18ff.}$) participating in; who is therefore teacher, not taught, nor open to condemnation ($37^{22f.}$), but humbly to be marvelled at and praised by men (36^{24}–37^{24}).

2. *Wait a little*] while Elihu sets forth his further defence of God.—*I have*] 𝔐 (*there are*), or, the entire line in 𝔐 might (Fried. Del.), but should not, be rendered, *God has yet words* (*to say*).—*On behalf of God*] cp. $13^{7.\,8}$ 42^{7} 21^{22}.

3. In justifying God [b], Job will speak comprehensively [a].

4. Elihu's words for God (^{2}) are not, as Job had pronounced ($13^{7f.}$) those of the friends to have been, false.—*He that is perfect in knowledge*] here Elihu: in 37^{16}, God.—*Is with thee*] is conversing with thee.

5–7. Without actually citing Job as in 33^{9-11} $34^{5f.}$ $35^{2f.}$, Elihu briefly states as the theme of what follows (down to ^{21}) that God is not, as Job had alleged, indiscriminate in His treatment of men; this theme is then developed in $^{8-21}$. In 𝔐 (see on ^{5}) two themes seem to be indicated: 1. God's might and wisdom; 2. His discriminating treatment of men: both these themes are treated subsequently, but in the reverse order (God's might, etc., from 36^{22} onwards).

5 Behold, God rejecteth not ⌜the perfect⌝,
6a ⌜And⌝ keepeth not the ungodly alive.
7a He withdraweth not his eyes from the righteous,
6b And he granteth the right of the wronged;
7b And with kings upon the throne,
He caused them to dwell for ever, and they are exalted.

---

5. 𝔐, awkwardly and with questionable rhythm, Behold God is mighty (34^{17}) and rejecteth (8^{20}) not (*i.e.* regards nothing and no one as too small to receive attention—Di.), Mighty in strength of heart, *i.e.* of intelligence (9^4 34^{34} 7^{17} (n.)). The translation above follows 𝔊 (cp. 8^{20}).—*Rejecteth not the perfect*] so 𝔊; Du., conjecturally, *rejecteth the hardened in heart*, *i.e.* the obstinately wicked who persistently refuses to obey God: cp. Ex. 7^{14} 9^7. Between 𝔊 and Du. (see phil. n.) the choice is difficult; it is in favour of Du.'s conjecture that it gives an entire distich to God's treatment of the wicked followed by a distich on His treatment of the righteous.

6a. Job had asked, "wherefore do the wicked live" (21^7): the answer is that Job is wrong as to the fact: the wicked do not live: God does not suffer it.—*Keepeth not alive*] cuts short life judicially, as Ex. 22^{17}; ct. Ps. 30^4 33^{19} 41^3. As God keeps the righteous in life, not, of course, for ever, but to the full normal period of human life, so He cuts off the wicked long before that period is reached (^{14}).

7 (with ^{6b}). While God rejects the wicked, bringing them to an untimely end $^{5.\ 6a}$, he never fails to look after the righteous: even though they may be wronged and for a time brought low, He rights them and greatly exalts them.—*The wronged*] Heb. *'ānī*, which "means properly *one humbled* or *bowed down*, especially by oppression, deprivation of rights, etc., but also, more generally, by misfortune . . . the *ānī*, while often, no doubt, a person in need, was primarily a person suffering some kind of social disability or distress"—Dr. in *DB* iv. 19.—7 b. c. Cp. 5^{11} n.

8–14. The right and the wrong way of accepting disciplinary suffering.

8–11. The right way: men who are afflicted are to recognize that they have transgressed, to give up their sin and to serve

8 And if ⌜he have⌝ bound them in fetters,
(And) they be caught in the cords of affliction,
9 Then he declareth to them their work,
And their transgressions, that they behave themselves proudly.
10 And he uncovereth their ear to instruction,
And commandeth that they return from naughtiness.
11 If they hearken ⌜to his voice⌝, and serve,
They complete their days in prosperity and their years in pleasure.
12 But if they hearken not, ‸they pass away,
And they expire without knowledge.
13 And they that are godless in heart cherish (?) anger;
They cry not for help when he hath bound them.
14 Their soul dieth in youth,
And their life among the temple-prostitutes.
15 He rescueth the wronged by the wrong which he suffers,
And uncovereth their ear by means of distress.

God: their reward is release from affliction, length of days and prosperity: cp. 33^{14-28}.

8. *If he have bound them*] cp. ^{13b}: 𝔐 *if* (*they are*) *bound.*—*Fetters . . . cords*] fig. (cp. Is. 28^{22}) of calamities and afflictions rather than literally, so that there would be an allusion to captives (12^{17-19}) loaded with *fetters* (Ps. 149^{8}, Nah. 3^{10}: Is. 45^{14}) and bound with *cords*.

9. *Declareth*] 33^{23}.—*Their work*] *i.e.* their evil work: cp. 33^{17}.—*Behave proudly*] or mightily: 15^{25} n.; Introd. § 41.

10. Cp. 33^{16}. 11 f. Cp. Is. $1^{19f.}$ On the text see phil. n.

12–14. The wrong way of accepting suffering—angrily ^{13a} and sullenly ^{13b}.

13. *Godless*] 8^{13} n.; *the godless in heart* occurs here only.—*Anger*] against God: on the strangeness of the Hebrew expression, see phil. n.—*They cry not*] to God; cp. 30^{20} 38^{41} where, however, the object is expressed.

14 b. They die the premature death (see phil. n.) of a temple-prostitute. If the text may be trusted, these male devotees to unchastity (*ḳᵉdēshim*: Dt. 23^{18}; see Dr.'s n. there) must, worn out by their excesses, have died, as a rule, at an early age, so that they became proverbial as victims of an untimely death.—*Life*] parallel to *soul*: see 33^{18} phil. n.

15. God uses the suffering inflicted on men by their fellow

16 But thou wast enticed away from (?) the mouth of confinement,
By amplitude without straitness,
And by what was set on thy table which was full of fatness.
17 And of judgment on the wicked thou art full;
Judgment and justice take hold (on thee).

---

then as a means of delivering and instructing sufferers who receive suffering in the right temper (cp. c. 35 with introductory n.). Possibly the v. consists of doublets of, or glosses on, $^{6b.\ 10a}$. Di. places it between ^{12} and ^{13}.—*The wronged*] ^{7} n.

16–21. In $^{5-15}$ Elihu has spoken in general terms of the righteous, the wicked, the wronged; he now deals specifically with Job. The text is scarcely intelligible; and details in the above translation are uncertain. Alternative translations of $^{16-19}$ by Di. and Du. will be found in the phil. nn. (p. 279 f.).

16. Job has not learned by what he suffered; on the other hand his ample and rich life had been his undoing: and (^{17}) he now suffers the lot of the wicked. Others have understood the v. quite differently, viz. as applying the comfort of ^{15} to Job's case: then render: Moreover he (*i.e.* God) hath enticed thee . . . unto amplitude . . . and what is set on thy table is full, etc.; or with Bu. making one or two slight emendations: Thee, too, he (*i.e.* God) entices out of the jaws of adversity; Amplitude, not straitness, is under thee; And what is set on thy table is full of fatness.—*Confinement*] צר (narrowness, fig. for distress, as 7^{11} 38^{23}; cp. the vb. in 18^{7} 20^{22}) is exactly antithetical (cp. Ps. 4^{2}) to width, amplitude (רחב) in ^{b}. But the entire phrase *from the mouth of narrowness* (or, *of the adversary*—צר as 19^{11} and often) is extraordinary and perhaps corrupt. It is highly artificial to interpret, as some have done, *mouth of confinement* as meaning the words or prayer addressed to God by a humble and patient sufferer.—*Amplitude*] lit. width; see last n., and cp. Ps. 18^{19} 31^{8} ("a wide place," as fig. of prosperity).—*Full of fatness*] loaded with rich fare; cp. Is. 25^{6}.

17. *Judgment on the wicked*] is punishment: cp. the use of the vb. דין, *to judge*, in Gn. 15^{14}: the v., then, if it has any

18 For (beware) lest wrath entice thee into mockery;
    And let not the greatness of the ransom turn thee aside.
19 Will thy riches be equal (to it) without affliction,
    Or all the exertions of strength?
20 Long not after the night,
    That peoples may go up ⌜from⌝ their place.
21 Take heed, turn not to iniquity;
    For thou hast chosen ⌜unrighteousness⌝ rather than affliction.

---

meaning, should mean Job is now suffering to the full the penalty assigned by God to wickedness. Others give the phrase the unparalleled meaning, the judgment passed by the wicked on God, and take the v. to be hypothetical: if you wickedly criticize God, God's justice will seize you.

18. Extremely uncertain; but apparently the meaning is: let not your anger at God's dealing with you lead you into irreverence; nor the severity of your sufferings, which form the ransom, or price (33^{24}), which God will accept in lieu of your life, deflect you, from the resignation with which suffering should be received, into rebellion against God. Unsatisfactory are such alternatives as: Because (there is such a thing as the) wrath (of God, beware) lest thou be enticed by (thy) sufficiency (cp. RV.); or, If (thou hast) wrath, let it not entice thee (Hi.).—*Mockery*] lit. *smiting* (of the hands in mockery): cp. 27^{23}; for the renderings *chastisement*, *sufficiency*, see phil. n.

19. Also very uncertain: see phil. n.—*Affliction*] צר, as [16].

20. Perhaps the most unintelligible of all these verses. Dr. explains: "challenge not the divine judgement ('night' being named as a time of disaster, $34^{20.\,25}$), which may prove to be of a kind in which whole peoples perish. Job has often desired to meet God in judgement (*e.g.* 13^{22} 23^{3-7})."

21b. Or, For on this account hast thou been tried through affliction: see phil. n.—*Unrighteousness*] 𝔐 *upon this*, which, referring to iniquity in [a], would express practically the same sense.

22–25. Let Job ([24]) join in the praise, which as human experience has shown, is called forth from men ([24b]) by their sight, distant and incomplete ([25b]), yet admiring ([25a]), of the

22 Behold, God doeth loftily in his strength;
Who is a teacher like unto him?
23 Who (ever) assigned to him his way?
And who (ever) said, "Thou hast wrought unrighteousness"?
24 Remember that thou extol his work,
Whereof men sing.
25 All mankind look on it,
Man seeth it from afar.
26 Behold, God is great, and we know not (how great);
The number of his years is unsearchable.

---

mighty (^{22a}) work of God, who takes His orders from (^{23a}), and gives account to (^{23b}), none.

22. *Doeth loftily*] (השׂגיב) far beyond (cp. ^{25b}) man's comprehension; cp. Ps. 139^{6} "the knowledge (of God's ways) is too wonderful for me: it is lofty (נשׂגבה)."—*A teacher*] the term of God, as (probably) Is. 30^{20}: the idea is common in the speeches of Elihu ($^{9f.}$ 35^{11} $33^{14ff.}$ 34^{32}). But the idea that God teaches "through the operations of His providence" (Dr.) is not quite naturally introduced into the present passage; and 𝔊 δυνάστης, *lord*, *ruler*, gives a far better parallel to ^{a} and transition to ^{23}.

23. Who ever, as His superior, laid down for God His line of action beforehand, or subsequently charged Him (as God was thought to charge the "gods" (Pss. 58. 82)) with having done His work badly? In view of 34^{13}, the alternative rendering of ^{a} (who ever visited upon Him, *i.e.* punished Him for, His way) is less probable. With ^{a}, cp. 21^{31}; with ^{b}, 9^{12}.—*His way*] 21^{31}.

24. *Sing*] cp. Ps. 104^{33} in reference, as here (cp. $^{27ff.}$), to the works of God in nature: of God's forgivenness, c. 33^{27}.

25. *Look on it*] with delight: cp. 33^{28} n.—b. Men catch only a far-off and therefore incomplete view of God's work (cp. 26^{14}).

26b. Cp. Ps 102^{28}: the line is not related to what follows here, and is awkwardly followed by *for* in ^{27}. Du. om. ^{26}, Bu. $^{25f.}$; but possibly ^{26b} at most is out of place, or corrupt.

27 ff. The illustrations of God's greatness and might ($^{22-25}$ (^{26a})) are drawn from atmospheric phenomena: rain, $36^{27f.}$ 37^{6b}; snow, 37^{6a}; ice, 37^{10}; thunder and lightning, $36^{29.33}$ $37^{2-4.11f.}$; light, $36^{30?}$ $37^{21f.}$; winds, $37^{9.21b}$; clouds, 37^{16} (see also

27 For he withdraweth ⌜drops from the sea⌝;
⌜He⌝ filtereth ⌜them⌝ through as rain ⌜from⌝ his mist;

---

under thunder); the sky, 37^{18}. With these illustrations are mingled a reiteration of the general theme, 37^{5}; reflections on the beneficent purpose of these works of God, 36^{31} (cp. ^{28b}); or their effect on the activities of men and beasts, $37^{7f.\ 18}$, or of Job in particular, 37^{17}; an exhortation to Job, 37^{14}; and a statement of the effect of the thunderstorm in particular on the emotions of Elihu, 37^{1}. The illustrations in this last part of Elihu's speech largely anticipate the first part of the immediately following speech of Yahweh, and some of them in a manner very unfavourable to unity of authorship. On the other hand, Bu. finds a strong argument for such unity by assuming that the thunderstorm described by Elihu is dramatically conceived as approaching as he concludes his speech (cp. 37^{1}), and as raging when Yahweh speaks, 38^{1}. The point would have more force if the description of the thunderstorm formed the climax to Elihu's speech; as it is, it is mingled with the description of other phenomena, such as ice, which were presumably not to be observed at the moment of speaking. The passing backwards and forwards from one phenomenon to another, and the interspersion of reflections, etc., are only partly removed by omitting $36^{29f.}$ $37^{13.\ 15f.}$ (Bu.), or $37^{7f.\ 12b}$ (Sgf.), or $36^{26.\ 27b.\ 28a\ 29\text{-}32}$ $37^{2\text{-}4.\ 6b.\ 11.\ 12a.\ b.\ 18}$ (Nichols, who regards the vv. as "a psalm of the Rainstorm," and 𝔊 which, however, also omits much more). Honth. rearranges as follows: $36^{27f.\ 31.\ 26}$ $37^{5b\text{-}10.\ 1\text{-}5a}$ $36^{29f.\ 32f.}$ $37^{11\text{-}24}$.

27 f. The production of rain.—"The author knows that clouds are formed by evaporation from the sea; the author of the divine speeches (38 ff.) is still ignorant of this, and assumes that God has somewhere store-houses for the atmospheric elements. . . . The author of the Elihu speeches must have lived a few centuries later than the poet, and had, probably through some Greek influence, acquired some new knowledge of physics" (Du.).

*27*a. 𝔐 *for he withdraweth the drops of rain*; this is obscurely expressed; it may have meant the same as the

28 Wherewith the skies pour down,
(And) drop upon many men.
29 ⌜And who⌝ understands the outspreadings of the clouds,
The crashings of his pavilion?
30 Behold, he spreadeth his ⌜mist⌝ about him,
And he covereth (with it) the ⌜tops⌝ of the ⌜mountains⌝.
31 For by means of these he ⌜nourisheth⌝ peoples;
He giveth food in abundance.
32 He covereth both hands with the light,
And commandeth it against the ⌜mark⌝.

---

emended text translated above; others render 𝔐 *he draweth down*, viz. from the "waters above the firmament" (Del. Du.); or questionably, *he gathers, collects*, viz. from the atmosphere (Bu.).—b. See phil. n.—*Mist*] or *cloud*, seems to be the meaning of the obscure word *'ēd* here and in [30]; in any case *flood* (so Assyr. *'edu*), preferred by many in Gn. $2^{6f.}$ (see Skinner, *ad loc.*), is unsuitable here.

28. *Many men*] or perhaps, *in showers on men*: see phil. n.

29. The v., if the text may be trusted, refers to the clouds of ([b]) the thunderstorm.—*And who understands*] 𝔐 *Yea, can one understand.—His pavilion*] *i.e.* the thunder-cloud: see phil. n.

30. The clouds, and in particular, perhaps, as most take it, the thunder-clouds (though for these "mist" (cp. [27]) is not perhaps the most suitable term), screen God, and also, settling on the mountain tops, blot them out from sight; cp. Ex. 19^{16}.—*Mist*] 𝔐 *light*: see phil. n.—*(With it) the tops of the mountains*] 𝔐 *the roots of the sea*: see phil. n.

31. The beneficent effect of God's activity in producing rain (cp. Is. 55^{10}) would be more naturally described immediately after [28] (Bu. Honth. Peake).—*Nourisheth*] 𝔐 *judgeth*, [a] in this case referring to the destructive thunderstorm of [29f.], [b] to the fertilizing rain of [27f.]. But the structure of the verse does not suggest an antithesis.—*By means of these*] if [31] immediately followed [28] the streaming skies of that v. are referred to: if not, *these* must be explained more generally of (Dr.) "the agencies of rain and storm alluded to in [27-30]."

32. The v., strangely expressed, appears to mean that God fills His hands from the volume of light that encompasses Him (see phil. n. on [30]), and despatches the light so seized earth-

33 ⸢The thunder⸣ declareth ⸢his indignation⸣,
⸢And⸣ the storm ⸢proclaimeth his⸣ anger.
XXXVII. 1 Yea, at this my heart trembleth,
And leapeth out of its place.
2 Hearken unto the rumbling of his voice,
And to the muttering that goeth out of his mouth.
3 He letteth it go under the whole heaven,
And his light(ning) to the ends of the earth.
4 After it a voice roareth;
He thundereth with his majestic voice;
And he delayeth not ⸢his lightnings⸣,
⸢From his mouth⸣ his voice is heard.

---

wards in the form of lightning. "But as though the poet had shrunk from carrying this half-mythical conception of God as the lightning-slinger further, he does not say "in order to sling it," but more in the spirit of his religion *and commandeth it against*" (Di.): on the other hand, Du. by emendation makes the figure still clearer: On the sling he balanceth the light, And slingeth it against the mark.

33. The above translation is very conjectural, but at least more probable than 𝕳, *his shouting* (or, more questionably rendered, *his war-cry*, or, as taken by 'ΑΣ 𝕾𝕿𝖁, *his friend*) *declareth concerning him, the cattle also concerning him who*, or *that which, cometh up*: see phil. n.

XXXVII. 1, 2. An expression of Elihu's emotion at the thunderstorm (1), and (2) an appeal to Job (and the friends—2a 𝕳, not 𝕲 (Θ)) to listen to it. Originally (cp. 𝕲), perhaps both vv. were addressed to Job alone, and read: At this do not thy inward parts (𝕲 36^{28} = 𝕳 37^{1}) tremble, And doth not thy (𝕲) heart leap out of its place? Hearken thou unto, etc.

2. *His voice*] the thunder; see Ps. $18^{14\,(13)}$ "uttereth his voice" || "thundereth," $29^{3\text{-}9}$, 1 S. 7^{10}, Ex. 9^{28} "voices of God."

3. The roll of the thunder fills, and the blaze of the lightning lights up, the whole expanse of sky and earth—poetical hyperbole, which scarcely *proves* that the writer shared the popular (ct. perhaps $36^{27f.}$) conception of the smallness of the earth (Du.).—*The ends*] lit. wings or skirts: cp. 38^{13}, Is. 11^{12} 24^{16}.

4. *His lightnings, from his mouth*] 𝕳 *them* (*i.e.* the lightnings)

5 ^He doeth wondrous things [past finding out],
Great things which we cannot comprehend;
6 For he commandeth the snow, "⌜Saturate⌝ the earth";
The downpour ⌜and⌝ the rain, ⌜Drop down⌝.
7 He sealeth up the hand of every man,
That all ⌜men⌝ may know his work.
8 Then the beasts go into lairs,
And rest in their dens.

---

when; an alternative emendation giving a better parallel is: He restraineth not *his throat* (cp. Is. 58^{1}), From his mouth, etc.: see phil. n.

5. At the beginning of the v. in 𝔐 stands, increasing the tautology of ^{4}, the line, *God thunders with his voice*, a virtual repetition of ^{4b}. The remainder of the v. (cp. 5^{9}), translated as above, resumes (after the completion for the present of the description of the thunder in ^{4}) the general statement of God's marvellous action (cp. 36^{26}), in order to illustrate this afresh from the phenomena of snow (^{6} introduced by *for*, as in 36^{27} after 36^{26}).

6–8. The snow and heavy rains of winter, which do their work at God's bidding, fertilizing the earth, and (^{7}) stopping for the time man's labour in the fields, and (^{8}) driving the beasts to shelter, are illustrations and proof of (^{5}) God's marvellous activity.

6. *Saturate*] cp. Ps. 65^{11} and (with snow) Is. 55^{10}. 𝔐 means, if anything, *Fall* (to the earth).—*The downpour*] not "shower" (RV.): for גשם is the heavy continuous rain of winter (Ca. 2^{11}, Am. 4^{7}, Ezr. 10^{9}); in virtue of its fertilizing function (Lv. 26^{4}, 1 K. 17^{14}, Is. 44^{14} 55^{10}) it was primarily regarded as a blessing (cp. Hos. 6^{3}), though it might also be an agent of destruction (Gn. 7^{12}, Ezk. 13^{11}).—^{b} is overloaded in 𝔐: see phil. n.; as otherwise emended the line would read, And the downpour of His mighty rains, which gives a poorer parallelism, or, And the downpour and the rain, "Be strong."

7. In winter man's hand must cease from (outdoor) work; or (emending, He sealeth up every man) men must stop at home. Hrz. Di. cite Homer's (*Il.* xvii. 549 f.) description of Zeus: *ὅς ῥά τε ἔργων ἀνθρώπους ἀνέπαυσεν ἐπὶ χθονί.* 𝔐 in ^{b} may be rendered either, that he may know all the men whom he

9 Out of the chamber cometh the whirlwind,
    And out of the ⌜store-houses⌝ (?) the cold.
10 By the breath of God ice is given,
    And the breadth of the waters is narrowed.
11 Yea, he ladeth the thick cloud with ⌜lightning⌝,
    (And) the cloud scattereth its light;
12 And it [goeth hither and thither] round about,
    Turning itself by his guidance,
  To do whatsoever he commandeth them,
    Upon the face of his habitable world,

---

hath made, or, that all the men whom he hath made may know (it); neither is satisfactory; see phil. n.

9–10. The cold of winter and its freezing of water: cp. $38^{29f.}$. It is more probable that ^{9} refers to the store-houses where wind, cold, etc., were thought to be kept in readiness for God's use (cp. 38^{22}, Ps. 135^7, Ecclus. 43^{14}) than to the regions from which, or the seasons, defined by the rising of stars and constellations, at which storm and cold come; but there are peculiarities and uncertainties in the text; see phil. n.—*Chamber*] synonymous with "treasury" (38^{22}) rather than (RV.) an abbreviation for "chamber of the south" (9^9 n.), or (Hoffm.) the name of a constellation.—*Whirlwind*] cp. 21^{18}, Is. 21^1.—*Store-houses*] 𝔐 *scatterers*, *winnowers*, which has been taken as an epithet for (north) winds, or for a constellation (𝔙 Arcturus).

10. The cold wind freezes the streams and pools (Ecclus. 43^{20}), which, shrinking, as they freeze, from the edges, become narrower. But, the contraction of water through frost is a much less conspicuous phenomenon than its solidifying (cp. 38^{30} and Ecclus. 43^{20}): and so, some (Bu.) take ^{b} to mean: the whole broad expanse of waters is constrained, *i.e.* congealed, frozen. Ehrlich emending in ^{a} (*melts* for *is given*), and rendering *becomes fluid* (instead of *is narrowed*) in ^{b}, refers the v. to the melting of the ice by the *warm* breath of God: cp. Ps. 147^{18}.—*The breath of God*] the wind: so Is. 40^7.

11. Description of the thunder-cloud and lightning resumed (cp. 36^{29}–37^5).—*Lightning*] or, by an equally slight emendation, *hail* (cp. hail and thunder and lightning in Egypt, Ex. $9^{23.24}$); 𝔐 *saturation*, *i.e.* moisture; but see phil. n.—**b.** On the incorrect translation of RVm. see phil. n.

13 Whether it be for a rod ⌜and⌝ for ⌜a curse⌝,
Or for mercy, that he causeth it to find (its mark).
14 Hear this, O Job, (and) stand still;
And consider the wonderful works of God.
15 Knowest thou about God's ordaining ⌜his works⌝,
And causing the light of his cloud to shine?

---

12. The lightning, which flashes in jagged lines, does not, as it might seem, move first this way, then that, at random, but always under the guidance of God (cp. 38^{35}), to fulfil His purposes of (^{13}) punishing or blessing men.—*It*] The light(ning) (Bu. Dr. Peake), not the cloud (Di. Del. Da.) of ^{11}.—*Goeth hither and thither*] see phil. n.: cp. the same vb. of God's "arrows" (*i.e.* lightnings) in Ps. 77^{18}.—*Turning itself*] the vb. used in Gn. 3^{24}.—*Them*] *i.e.* the flashes of lightning; or, emending, *it*, *i.e.* the lightning.

13. *Rod*] 21^{9}.—*And for a curse*] 𝔐 has been rendered (1) *or for his earth*, which between "for a rod" and "for mercy" (clauses of identical form) is altogether heterogeneous and impossible; or (2) *if* (*that be*) *for* (*the good of*) *his earth*, which is scarcely more probable. Emendation is necessary: with the translation above (Du.), cp. En. 59^{1}: They lighten for a blessing and for a curse as the Lord of Spirits willeth. An alternative emendation (Dr. al.) is to omit *or*, leaving *a rod for his earth*.—*Or for mercy*] "viz. for the deliverance of His people from their foes (Ps. 18^{14}, Is. $30^{30.\,31}$)"—Dr.; but a national allusion is not altogether probable. Certainly thunder and lightning are not generally mentioned as agents of mercy (yet cp. En. 59^{1}); Bu. therefore (since it would be awkward to refer back to the cloud of ^{11}) omits the v. Since with ^{14} Elihu takes a fresh start, this v. might perhaps be regarded as a conclusion, not merely to $^{11f.}$, but to the whole section beginning with ^{5}: God does wonderful things ^{5}, as illustrated in $^{6-12}$, whether ^{13} to punish or to bless.

15–18. Questions after the manner of, and in some degree anticipating, the speech of Yahweh (c. 38 f.), and intended to imply that Job has not knowledge of, and cannot (^{18}) perform, the works of God.

15. *Knowest thou*] cp. 38^{33} $39^{1f.}$.—*Ordaining his works*] 𝔐 *laying* (*his charge*) *upon them*, *i.e.* the natural agencies just

16 Knowest thou the balancings of the clouds,
The wonders of him that is perfect in knowledge?
17 Thou whose garments are warm,
When the earth is still by reason of the south wind,
18 Wilt thou with him beat out the skies (into a firmament),
(Which are) strong as a molten mirror?
19 Make ⌜me⌝ to know what we (men) shall say to him;
We cannot state our case by reason of darkness.
20 Should it be told him that I would speak?
Or did ever man say that he would be swallowed up?

---

described. Parallel to the general reference to God's works in ^{a} is the special reference to the marvel of the lightning in ^{b}; in ^{16} the special marvel of the (rain-laden) clouds poised in the air in ^{a} is followed by the general reference in ^{b}. So at least in the present text; but ^{15a} is clumsy, and ^{16b} rather uncertain: see phil. n.

17. Every time a sirocco is coming, in the stillness that precedes it, Job suffers from the suffocating heat; if he is thus a helpless victim of forces that God controls, can he really (^{18}) perform mighty works like God?—*South wind*] elsewhere in the OT. the sirocco, which blows up from the deserts E. and S.E. of Palestine, is termed the east wind; but cp. Lk. 12^{55}.

18. 𝔊 omits this v.: Bi. Du. place it before ^{21}; Ehrlich, before 38^{4}.—Can Job, like (40^{15} n.) God (Gn. 1^{6}), create the firmament? Can he beat out that vast solid metal-like (^{b}; cp. Dt. 28^{23}) fixed expanse of sky? The firmament was a solid surface supporting above it waters, which could only come through when the "windows" of this firmament, generally closed, were opened (Gn. 1^{7} 7^{11}).—*Skies*] cp. (‖ to "heavens") 35^{5}, Pr. 8^{28}, Ps. 36^{6} 57^{11}. But the word may also refer more particularly to the clouds (cp. 38^{37} (‖ "water-skins of heaven"), Ps. 77^{18} (‖ "clouds")) in which sense Bu. understands the term here. But ^{b} (of which Bu. takes no account) is very unfavourable to this.—*Molten mirror*] the ordinary mirror was a polished metal (Ex. 38^{8}) surface.

19. *Me*] most MSS of 𝔐, *us*; *i.e.* Elihu and those like-minded with him (cp. 34^{2}).—*Darkness*] ignorance: cp. Eccl. $2^{13f.}$.

20. For ignorant (^{19b}) man to utter to God a case against Him would be equivalent to seeking his own destruction—an unheard of thing (^{20b}), which Elihu has no desire to attempt (^{20a}),

[21] And now men saw not the light,
It was obscure (?) in the skies;
But a wind passed and cleansed them.

---

unless, indeed, Job, who has often expressed a wish to speak to God, could, in reply to Elihu's ironical request ([19a]), tell him what words he might safely plead. Such, if 𝔐 is correct, appears to be the meaning and connection. Du. cleverly emends: Hath He (God) a reprover when He speaks, or doth a man say that He (God) is perplexed? But see phil. n.—*Swallowed up*] destroyed, by God; cp. 2[8] n.

21-24. The conclusion of Elihu's speech is exceedingly obscure and ambiguous, in spite of the fact that, with the exception of one word (בהיר, meaning perhaps *obscure*, perhaps *bright* (see phil. n.), in [21b]), the vocabulary is unusually familiar. The tristich in [21], and the rhythm in [23], suggest that the obscurity may be partly due to the loss or misplacement of lines or clauses. The point of the whole is expressed in [24], which probably means: men in general fear God [a], let Job do the same (implied) [b]. In what precedes [24], it is possible to suspect, though not to discern with any certainty, allusions to certain remarkable observations or theories of natural phenomena.

21. The opening phrase *And now* is ambiguous, and has been understood temporally of the present in contrast whether to the past or the future, or (as in 35[15]) consequentially, as drawing a conclusion from what has been just said. Among the translations and interpretations which have been proposed, there may be noticed: "(1) [a] And now men cannot look upon (ראה in this sense without ב as Pr. 23[31]) the light (= the sun, as 31[26]), [b] (When) it is bright in the skies, [c] And the wind hath passed and cleansed them": so Ros. Ew. Da. RVm. and (at least in preference to RV.) Dr. Peake; but on this view of [a], [c] is obviously otiose; the sun shining brightly in a clear sky is always too dazzling to look at, and not only just after a wind has cleared clouds away; moreover, in [a] "cannot" would be more naturally expressed by the impf.; it must here, if correct, be explained as a paraphrase of: "men, as we know from experience, do not"; and, further, "When it is" in [b] would be

[22] Out of the north cometh ⸢splendour⸣,
Upon God is terrible majesty.

---

more naturally expressed by a different order of words (והוא בהיר). The connection with [22] on this view is: If men cannot look on the sun, how much less on the majesty of God. (2) "And now men see not the light, (Though) it is bright in (*i.e.* behind) the clouds (on the alternative renderings "clouds" and "skies" see [18] n.), But a wind passeth over and cleanseth them" (and then men do see the sun): so 𝔙 (in [a] and [c]) Hi. Del. RV. (virtually). This is taken to be a figurative way of saying that God now hidden may at any moment reveal Himself. But the use of pf. tenses or the impf. with waw consec. throughout renders any translation involving such a sharp contrast between present and future most improbable. (3) Bu. emends and renders, And now we see not the light, While it is obscure owing to the clouds, But the wind passeth over, etc., and interprets the v. of the weather actually prevailing at the moment when Elihu is speaking; the sun is for the moment obscured by the thunder-cloud, but the cloud will pass, and ([22a]) the sky clear up from the northwards. The use of the tenses in [c] is as unfavourable to this view as to the last. (4) Du. places [21b] (It is bright in the sky) after [22a], with which it forms a quite possible distich; and [21a. c] after [18], taking [21a. c] precariously as conditional: And if (at any time) men see not the light (owing to clouds obscuring it), A wind passes over and cleanses it (?).

22. *The north*] is not here introduced as the quarter from which the ancients obtained their gold (for see phil. n.), or as the quarter in which the sky cleared up ([21c]) after rain, for according to Pr. 25^{23} the N. was the proverbially rainy quarter; but more probably (Dr.) "the allusion may be to the Aurora Borealis, the streaming rays of which, mysteriously blazing forth in the northern heavens, may well have been supposed to be an effulgence from the presence of God Himself" (cp. [b]); from the N. came the chariot of Ezekiel's vision (Ezk. 1^4): in the N. was the seat of the Most High (Is. 14^{13}).—*Splendour*] 𝔐 *gold*; see phil. n.

23 The Almighty—we have not found him out:
Great in strength and judgment,
And abounding in righteousness, he doth not ⌜pervert⌝.
24 Therefore men fear him;
He seeth not any that are wise of heart.

---

23. God is incomprehensible, yet we know enough to assert that He is righteous: this seems to be the meaning, though it is loosely expressed.—*We have not found him out*] discovered Him, fathomed the wisdom that rules His action; cp. 11^7, where, however, as also in Eccl. 3^{11}, the obj. is not personal; and in 23^3 (Job's wish that he might find God) where the obj. is personal as here, but the sense rather different.—b. c. 𝔊 may be rendered as above; 𝔐, much less probable, means He is great in strength, and He doeth no violence to (lit. afflicteth not) judgement and abundance of righteousness; see phil. n.—*Pervert*] sc. justice (cp. 8^3 34^{12}), or *subvert*, sc. a man in his cause (cp. 19^6). 𝔊 may mean either *afflict* (so 𝔐), or *answer*, viz. man's questions (but see 38^1 and even $33^{14ff.}$).

24. This v. also is awkwardly expressed: but ª is clear, and the meaning and implication of the whole apparently is: ordinary men fear God; so should you; for to the wise in their own conceit (qui sibi videntur esse sapientes: 𝔙), God pays no regard (cp. 5^{13}).—*Seeth*] regards, pays heed to: cp. Ps. 138^6 and (with a different vb.) 35^{13}.

XXXVIII.-XL. 2. Yahweh's speech in reply to Job, now separated from Job's appeal at the end of c. 31 by the interpolated cc. 32–37: see Introd. Yahweh now responds to Job's frequently expressed and (31^{35}) just reiterated wish that He would answer him; but not, as he had asked (31^{35-37} and previously 13^{22}), by formulating charges which were, as soon as formulated, to be shown to be baseless, but, as he had feared ($9^{3.\ 14ff.}$ 13^{20-25}), overwhelming him with questions which he cannot answer; and yet, if not altogether as he had hoped, by no means altogether as he had feared; for Yahweh's questions are not directed, as Job had feared ($9^{16-20.\ 28-35}$), towards impugning Job's integrity, or fastening on him the guilt of sins punishable by such sufferings as his had been; but towards showing Job that in maintaining his own he had in his ignorance im-

pugned God's integrity. The current theory of sin and suffering had led the friends through ignorance to condemn Job, and Job through ignorance to obscure the wider purposes of God and to misrepresent Him. Job had been right in maintaining his integrity and that his sufferings were not due to his sins, as Yahweh subsequently (42^{7}) makes clear: he had been wrong in passing beyond this matter of personal knowledge, and in reproving God whose range of purpose and action lay so far beyond his knowledge. The main point of the speech that Job in his ignorance had misrepresented God is briefly put in the challenging questions with which the speech opens (38^{2}) and closes (40^{2}). The main body of the speech (38^{4}–39^{30}), also consisting for the most part of questions, is designed to bring out the immensity of Job's ignorance and the greatness of God's knowledge and His beneficent use of it. These questions fall into two main groups, referring (1) to the inanimate world, its creation and maintenance, 38^{4-38}; and (2) to animals, and in particular wild animals, their maintenance and habits, 38^{39}–39^{30}. The first group of questions refers in detail to the creation of earth ($^{4-7}$), and sea ($^{8-11}$); the succession of night and day ($^{12-15}$); the extent of the sea (^{16}), of the realm of death (^{17}), and of the earth (^{18}); the home of light and darkness ($^{19f.}$), snow and hail (^{22}), wind (^{24}); the descent of rain and lightning to the earth ($^{25-27}$); the origin of rain, dew and ice ($^{28-30}$); the stars ($^{31-33}$); clouds and lightning ($^{34f.}$), clouds and rain ($^{37f.}$). The animals which form the subjects of questions are lions $^{39f.}$, (ravens ^{41} n.), wild goats 39^{1-4}, wild asses $^{5-8}$, wild oxen $^{9-12}$, ostriches $^{13-18}$, horses $^{19-25}$, hawks and vultures $^{26-30}$—one domesticated (the horse), the rest wild. Some of these passages ($39^{13-18.\ 19-25}$) have been suspected of being interpolations, but for reasons that are inconclusive: see on 39^{13-18}.

1. *Yahweh*] as $40^{1.\ 3.\ 6}$ 42^{1} and throughout the Prologue and Epilogue; (see Introd. § 19).—*Job*] is mentioned by name, although he was the last speaker (cc. 32–37 being an interpolation) and had but just finished speaking, in accordance with the writer's manner; cp. $1^{7f.}$, And the Satan answered Yahweh . . . and Yahweh answered the Satan: and so $1^{9.\ 12}$ $2^{4.\ 6}$.—*The tempest*] (סערה) which was considered to be the normal

XXXVIII. 1 And Yahweh answered Job out of the tempest, and said,

> 2 Who is this that darkeneth the purpose (of God),
> With words (spoken) without knowledge?
> 3 Gird up thy loins now like a mighty man;
> And I will ask thee, and declare thou unto me.

---

accompaniment of a theophany: cp. Ps. 18, Hab. 3, Ps. 50^{3}, And fire goeth before Him, and round about it is very tempestuous (נשׂערה), Nah. 1^{3}, Ezk. 1^{4}, Zec. 9^{14} (all סערה), Ps. 83^{16} (סער). Out of this tempest there now comes the voice of God (cp. Ezk. $1^{4.\,28}$, ct. 1 K. $19^{11f.}$) challenging and questioning, but not, as Job had feared, crushing him (9^{17}). On Bu.'s view that the tempest is that described in $37^{2ff.}$ see on $36^{27ff.}$ 37^{21}.

2. The question implies a double rebuke: (1) Job has spoken ignorantly, [b]; and (2) he has thereby obscured what should be plain, viz., that a divine purpose underlies the constitution and maintenance of the world, [a]. The questions that follow have a corresponding double aim: they suggest the repeated answer that God knows and Job does not, and that God achieves, as Job cannot, the end to which His knowledge is applied (cp. 42^{2}).—*Darkeneth*] *i.e.* hides or conceals (cp. 42^{3}); cp. Ps. 139^{12}. The darkness *darkens* not from Thee.—*The purpose*] in Hebrew undefined (*purpose*, or *a purpose*) and used with the widest reference to God's purpose or purposes in the world-order; for the meaning of the word (עצה), though in several of the following passages it is cited of more special plans or purposes of God, cp. Ps. 33^{9}, For He spake and it came to pass; He commanded, and it held good (lit. stood): Yahweh frustrateth the purpose of the nations, Annulleth what the peoples devise: The *purpose* of Yahweh holdeth good for ever, What His heart deviseth to all generations; Pr. 19^{21}, Many devices are in a man's heart, But Yahweh's *purpose* is realized (תקום); Is. 19^{17}, The *purpose* of Yahweh which He purposeth against it; 46^{10}, What I purpose is realized (עצתי תקום), and what I wish I do; see also Is. 5^{19}, Mic. 4^{12}, Jer. 49^{20}.

3. *Gird up*, etc.] prepare for action (12^{21} n.); into the coming conflict of argument with God, Job, like a warrior (𝔐 *like a man*), must enter with loins girt (Is. 5^{27}).

[4] Where wast thou when I founded the earth?
  Declare, if thou hast understanding.
[5] Who fixed the measures thereof, since thou knowest?
  Or who stretched the line over it?

4–7. **The creation of the earth.**—The earth is represented as a vast building carefully constructed according to plan ([5]), and its foundation stones laid ([6]) to the jubilation of the onlookers ([7]); Job was not among these onlookers, and had no part in or first-hand knowledge of the ceremony (cp. 15[7f.]), though he has spoken as if he had ([5b. 6a]). For earth conceived as a building, cp., if Esharra is the earth (so Zimmern in *KAT*[3] 496, 510, after Jensen), the Babylonian poem of Creation, iv. 143 ff. (Rogers, *CP* 32): And the Lord measured the construction (Zimmern: building; see Jensen's note in *KB* vi. 344) of the Deep, And he founded Esḫarra (*i.e.* the earth), a mansion like unto it, The mansion Esharra which he built like heaven.

4. If Job was present at Creation ([a]) and if thereby [b] he acquired wisdom (cp. 15[8b]), let him answer the questions that follow in [5ff.].—*Founded*] so commonly with the earth as obj.: see Is. 48[13] 51[13. 16], Zec. 12[1], Ps. 24[2] 89[12] 102[26] 104[5], Pr. 3[19].—b. Cp. [18] 42[3].—*Hast understanding*] lit. *knewedst* (or *knowest*) *understanding*; the idiom as Is. 29[24], Pr. 4[1], 1 Ch. 12[33], 2 Ch. 2[11. 12]; *understanding* is a synonym for wisdom, and often used in parallelism with it; see, *e.g.*, 28[12] 39[17], Dt. 4[6], Is. 29[14].

5. The scale of this great house and its parts was determined beforehand, and marked off on the site which it was to occupy. Cp. for the measurements and the use of the measuring line preparatory to building, Ezk. 40[3]–43[17], Zec. 1[16], My house shall be built in it (Jerusalem), and a line shall be stretched forth over Jerusalem, *i.e.* both temple and city will be rebuilt; Jer. 31[39].—*Who*] or, *what is he who*: and so in [b] the question asks not what being (for this is already defined in [4a]), but what *manner* of being planned the world; the interrogative is used rather similarly in Am. 7[2], As who (RV, "how") shall Jacob stand; cp. also Ru. 3[16].—*Since*] ironically (cp. [21]) or *if* (cp. Pr. 30[4]), or *that*: see phil. n.

6 Whereupon were the sockets thereof sunk,
Or who laid the corner-stone thereof,
7 When the morning stars sang together,
And all the sons of the gods shouted for joy?

6a. On what were the sockets (Ex. 26^{19}, Ca. 5^{15}) of the pillars that support the earth (9^{6} n.) made to rest? On nothing (26^{7} n.)? Is Job prepared to assert this marvel?

7. The ceremony of laying the foundations of the earth was an occasion for joyous music, as were the foundation ceremonies of earthly buildings (Ezr. $3^{10f.}$). The singers were stars, here conceived as existing before the world (ct. Gn. 1^{16}), and the sons of the gods (1^{6} n., cp. Ps. 29^{2}). As the world's first morning broke, the stars still shining sang their song of praise; cp. Ps. 19^{2} 148^{3} (after the mention of the angels and the host of God in v.^{2}).—*Sang*] rang out their joy at the mighty work of God; so the same vb. (רנן), *e.g.*, in Is. 12^{6} 24^{14}, Zec. 2^{14}, Is. 49^{13} (subject, the heavens) and in parallelism with the same vb. (הריע) as here in Is. 44^{23}, Zeph. 3^{14}.—*The morning stars*] to be explained as above, not with Hi. Del. on the analogy of the "Orions" of Is. 13^{10} of the morning star (Ecclus. 50^{6} 𝔊, not 𝔥) and others next to it in brightness.

8–11. *The origin of the sea.*—The sea is a being that was born (so ^{8b} at least; cp. Ps. 90^{2} of the earth)—a monster needing to be held in restraint ($^{10f.}$) lest (such may be the thought) it should endanger ($^{4\text{-}7}$) God's building, the earth. From whom or how this monster was born is not said; the womb from which it issued is left undefined; and thus its origin, unlike that of the earth, is not traced directly to God. Nevertheless its dependence (^{9}) on God at and from birth, and God's supremacy over it ($^{10f.}$) from the beginning onwards, illustrate the power and wisdom and the uniqueness of God. The original independence of the sea and the stern conflict with it before it was subdued, which belong to the mythology lying behind these verses, are blurred by the fundamental monotheism of the writer, who for purposes of poetry does not, however, refrain from introducing traits that only receive their full explanation from polytheistic thought: see on 7^{12} 9^{13} 26^{12}.

8 [Or where wast thou] ⌜when⌝ the sea ⌜was born,⌝
When it burst out, issuing from the womb;
9 When I made the cloud its garment,
And the thick cloud its swaddling-bands,
10 And ⌜prescribed its⌝ limit for it,
And set bars and doors,
11 And said, "Hitherto thou mayest come, and no further,
And here shall thy proud waves ⌜be stayed⌝"?
12 Hast thou (ever) since thy days (began) commanded the morning,
(Or) hast thou caused the dawn to know its place;

8a. 𝔐 *And he hedged about the sea with doors*, which is unsatisfactory: see phil. n. Gu. (*Schöpf. u. Chaos*, 92), *who helped*, *i.e.* rendered the first services (cp. Ezk. 16^{4}), *when* etc.?—*The womb*] it is questionable whether the writer at all clearly defined to himself what or whose was the womb, whether chaos (Du. Peake) or the interior of the earth (Di.).

9. The fig. of the newborn child is continued; immediately after birth, it must be [a] clothed and [b] swaddled (Ezk. 16^{4}), and for these offices the newborn giant was dependent on Yahweh. Its garments are the clouds that gather over its surface; its swaddling-bands the darkness conceived as surrounding the horizon.

10. 𝔐, *And I brake my limit*, or *boundary*, upon, or *against it*, which is supposed to mean I made the broken, indented coast line its boundary: see phil. n.—**b.** Yahweh prevents the monster from escaping from its allotted limit by means of barred doors.

11b. See phil. n. Cp. Ps. 89^{10}.

12–15. The constant return of morning and the effect of light.—Every day since the world began morning has broken and light has played its marvellous part—ethical ($^{13.\ 15}$) and physical (^{14})—at God's command; but (^{12}) has Job, not indeed *throughout* his brief life, but on any single day of it, issued the command and secured its discharge? On these vv. see phil. n. on ^{14} (end).

12. Each day takes its appointed place (cp. $3^{8\text{-}10}$) at God's command.

13 That it might take hold of the skirts of the earth,
And that (so) the wicked might be shaken off it?
14 It changeth like clay under a seal,
And ⌜is dyed⌝ like a garment;
15 And their light is withholden from the wicked,
And the raised arm is broken.
16 Hast thou come unto the springs of the sea?
Or hast thou walked in the recesses of the deep?
17 Have the gates of Death been revealed to thee?
Or have the gate-keepers of Darkness ever ⌜seen thee⌝?

---

13. "The fact that the light has the effect of detecting and dispersing evil-doers is expressed under a beautiful poetical figure: the earth is pictured as a vast coverlet; and the dawn, which darts in a moment from east to west (Ps. 139^{9}), seizes this by its extremities, brings to light the wicked upon it, and shakes them off it like dust" (Dr.); cp. for the opposition of light to evil-doers, 24^{13-17}.—*Skirts of the earth*] 37^{3}.

14. The earth, deprived by night of both form and colour, receives both again at dawn, which [a] stamps it afresh, so that all objects on it stand out in clear relief, and [b] colours it afresh as a garment that is dyed.—*Is dyed*] 𝔐 *they* (*i.e.* the objects on the earth) *stand forth*.

15. Overtaken by morning in the pursuit of high-handed crime, the wicked are brought to justice and punishment.—*Their light*] which is night, darkness; 24^{17}.

16–18. The depths and breadths of the earth.—As limited as is Job's range through time, is his range through space: he has never fathomed the depth $^{16f.}$, nor traversed the breadth ^{18}, of God's creation.

16. *Springs*] if this be the meaning (see phil. n.) the reference is to the "hidden channels connecting the sea with the great abyss of water (the "great deep"), which the Hebrews conceived to extend under the earth (Ps. 24^{2} 136^{6}: cp. Gen. 49^{25}, Ex. 20^{4}), and from which the waters of the sea were supposed to be derived" (Dr.).—*Recesses*] see phil. n. and 11^{7} n.

17. If the depths of the sea $(^{16})$ are unknown to Job, still more the greater depths (11^{8} 7^{9} 26^{5}, Ps. 86^{13}, Ezk. 32^{18}) of

18 Hast thou shown thyself attentive to the breadths of the earth?
Declare, if thou knowest it all.
19 Which way dwelleth light;
And darkness—where is its place;
20 That thou shouldest take it to its boundary,
And ⌜bring it into⌝ the paths to its house?
21 Thou knowest, for then thou wast born,
And the number of thy days is great.

Sheol. The dark underworld, the gated realm of death, is open and wholly known to Yahweh (26^6); even its outside is unknown to Job; one day, no doubt, Job will see those gates, but he will gain his knowledge, unlike Yahweh, at the expense of freedom and life. Death = Abaddon (28^{22}) = Sheol (26^6, Ps. 6^6).—*Gates of Death*] Ps. 9^{14} 107^{18}; cp. "gates of Sheol," Is. 38^{10} in all which passages, differently from here, the gates of death are conceived as approached in severe sickness.—*Gate-keepers*] so 𝔊: 𝔐 *gates*, as in [a].—*Darkness*] cp. $10^{21f.}$: for the word (צלמות) see 3^5 n. Cp. the use of darkness (חשך ‖ land of oblivion) of Sheol in Ps. $88^{13\,(12).\,7\,(6)}$.—*Have . . . ever seen thee?*] 𝔐 *canst thou see?* 𝔊 *have . . . terrified thee*, the gate-keepers being conceived as terrifying monsters.

18. *Attentive to*] see phil. n.; or, *to have understanding* (^{4b}) *of*.—b. Cp. ^{4b}.—Bi. Du. see in ^{21} the direct continuation of this v., Du. placing $^{19f.}$ after ^{15}.

19f. The homes of light and darkness.—Light and darkness, since they were separated (Gn. $1^{3f.}$) at creation (cp. "then," ^{21}), have separate dwellings: light at close of day, its daily work abroad being done, returns to its house, and so does darkness at the close of night. Does Job know which way these houses lie? Can he take light or darkness even to the confines of its home, to the paths that lead up to it? Some (Di. Bu.) understand ^{20a} to refer to fetching light or darkness out of its house into the territory or region in which it has to exercise its daily function, ^{20b} to taking it home.—*Bring it unto*] 𝔐 *discern* or *understand*.

21. Ironical: of course Job knows; for he is as old as creation: cp. 15^7 (Eliphaz).

22 Hast thou entered the treasuries of snow,
Or seest thou the ⌜store-houses⌝ of hail,
23 Which I have reserved against the time of distress,
Against the day of war and of battle?
24 Which is the way to where the ⌜wind⌝ is distributed,
(And) the sirocco scattered over the earth?
25 Who hath channelled a conduit for the rain-flood,
And a way for the lightning of the thunder;

---

22 f. **Snow and hail.**—*Treasuries*] cp. 37^{9} n., Dt. 28^{12} ("his goodly treasury the heavens"), Jer. 10^{13} ("He bringeth forth wind from His treasuries"), En. 41^{4} 60^{11-21} (chambers of winds, snow, mist, rain, treasury of peals of thunder).—*Store-houses*] 𝔐 *treasuries*, as [a].

23. Snow and hail are kept by God in His store-houses till He requires them for purposes of judgement, *e.g.* for ruining the crops of evil-doers, or [b] confounding them in battle. Cp. Ex. 9^{22-26}, Is. 28^{17}, Ezk. 13^{13}, Hag. 2^{17}, Sir. $39^{29f.}$ (fire and hail . . . these also are formed for judgement . . . all these are created for their uses, and they are in His treasury, against the time when they are required); for hail in battle, Jos. 10^{11}, Is. $30^{30f.}$; for snow, 1 Mac. 13^{22} (not cited as a divine judgement), Ps. 68^{14} (?).—*Reserved against*] see phil. n. and 21^{30}.

24. **Winds** have their chambers, too; but where? Cp. En. 41^{4} 60^{12}, "and the angel . . . showed me . . . the chamber of the winds, and how the winds are divided."—*Wind*] 𝔐 *light*; see phil. n.

25–27. Two marvels connected with the descent of **rain**, one common also to **lightning**. The rain (1) descends by a way determined (cp. 28^{26}) for it, as also does the lightning, however much it may appear to flash at hazard: (2) the rain falls (not only for the service of man, but), fulfilling purposes of God which have wider objects than men, on uninhabited country; for this wider range of God's providence left unconsidered by Job in his anthropocentric discussion of God's ways, cp. $39^{1ff.}$ and Ps. $104^{16-18.\ 20-22.\ 25}$.

25. *Channelled*] *pillag*, cp. *peleg*, channel (29^{6}).—*A conduit*] the same word is used of channels for irrigation (Ezk.

26 Causing it to rain on a land (which) none (inhabiteth),
On the wilderness wherein is no man;
27 To satisfy (the land of) devastation and desolation,
And to make ⌜the thirsty (land)⌝ sprout with young grass?
28 Hath the rain a father?
Or who hath begotten the drops of night-mist?
29 Out of whose womb came the ice?
And who gave birth to the hoar frost of heaven?
30 Like a stone waters ⌜cohere together⌝,
And the face of the deep ⌜is hidden⌝.
31 Dost thou fasten the bands of the Pleiades (?),
Or untie the cords of Orion (?)?

31^4), pipes feeding a reservoir (Is. 7^3), a trench to contain water (1 K. 18^{32}): here of pipes conceived as existing to conduct the rain down from heaven to earth.—*Rain-flood*] here (ct. Ps. 32^6 and the vb. in Is. 8^8) of a heavy rain descending.

25b. = 28^{26b}.

27. *Thirsty land*] 𝕳 *place of coming forth*: see phil. n.

28. Rain and night-mist.—These things have no human source; with the figures of begetting and birth, cp. 8^{29}.—*Night-mist*] 29^{19} n.

29–30. Frost and ice.—Frozen water is solid as stone ^{30a}, and ^{b} hides the still unfrozen water beneath; see phil. n.

31 f. The stars and constellations—can or does Job, like God, regulate the movement of these, causing them to rise and set, and at different times of year to take different positions in the heavens? This in general seems to be the sense of the vv., though in details these are full of uncertainties. The constellations appear to be mentioned here, after the meteorological questions of $^{22-29}$, on account of the ancient association of their movements with changes in the seasons and weather (see on 9^7).

31. The vbs. are certainly antithetical, the nouns (though their meaning is uncertain) are probably synonymous; the identification of the constellations, particularly the Pleiades is disputed (see on 9^9). The meaning in general appears to be:

can you, like God, fasten together (something belonging to or something constituting) one constellation or unfasten another? In view of the consistent tone of the questions throughout the speech—can or does Job do what God does?—we must rule out what in itself would be a perfectly possible alternative: can Job fasten what God looses, or loose what God fastens? Consequently the constellation named in [a] was actually conceived as being, at least at times, bound, that in [b] as unbound. But with the ambiguity of the nouns, the uncertain identification of the constellations, and our imperfect knowledge of the Hebrew mythology or stories of the constellations, it is impossible to get beyond very uncertain conjectures as to the exact meaning or the exact nature of any of the myths which may be alluded to.—*Fasten the bands of*] or, *fasten into a cluster*: this has been explained of the closeness of the stars to one another in the Pleiades (Ew. Di.: do you perpetually keep the stars of the Pleiades clustered close together?), or, in various ways, of restraining the constellation in question; *e.g.* those who identify the constellation not with the Pleiades, but with Canis major think of the chains with which Orion restrains his hound (so Burney, *EBi.* 4782); but this makes the activity of God secondary, and the question equivalent to, Can you, like *Orion*, hold the Dog in check? On AV. RVm. (meaning, Canst thou bind the sweet influences of the Pleiades, so as to restrain the gracious season of spring, or [b] dismiss winter before its time?) see phil. n.—*The Pleiades*] other identifications are Canis major (see last n.) which contains Sirius, or the Scorpion (Jensen in *ZA* i. 264).—*Untie the cords of Orion*] if [a] refers to the closeness of the stars to one another in the constellation, this should refer to the greater distance between the stars of another: so, *e.g.*, Bu., who sees a reference to the conspicuous change in apparent distance between the stars of Orion according to its height in the sky. But in the cords it is now more usual to see a reference to the bonds which kept Orion for ever fixed in the sky (see on 9^9); the untying or loosening of these may refer to Orion's being dragged higher up or lower down the sky (Di.).

32. *Bring forth*] Is. 40^{26}.—*Mazzaroth*] doubtless the name of

[32] Dost thou bring forth Mazzaroth in its season,
Or lead the Bear with her children?
[33] Knowest thou the laws of the heavens?
Dost thou establish their rule in the earth?
[34] Dost thou lift up thy voice to the cloud,
That abundance of waters may cover thee?

---

a star or constellation, but what is altogether uncertain: see phil. n.—*Or lead*, etc.] 𝕳 may also be translated (pointing תְּנַחֵם), or comfort the Bear for (the loss of her) sons; this would presumably refer to some unknown mythological trait; but the translation, as giving a bad parallel to [a], is improbable.—*The Bear*] Hebr. *'Ayish* (or *'Iyyush*): the *meaning* of 'Ayish is quite unknown and cannot be invoked to assist in identifying the star(s) intended. If the constellation referred to be the Bear, *'Ayish* is, strictly, the name of the four stars composing the square, *her children* (or *sons*) the three stars of the tail: cp. the Arabic name for the constellation *na'š* (in no way connected with the Hebr. *'Ayish*), *the bier*, for the four stars, which resemble the bearers of a bier, and *banât na'š*, *the daughters of the bier*, for the three stars, which resemble the followers (Lane, *Arabic Lex.* 2816c). If the constellation intended is the Pleiades (9^9 n.), 'Ayish is probably the name of its brightest star, *her children* the remaining stars: 𝕿 renders *the Hen with her children*—a description actually applied to the Pleiades by some peoples.

33. *The laws of the heavens*] the laws (חקות) enjoined by God on the heavens in respect to the appearance or disappearance of constellations, the change of night and day, etc. Cp. Jer. $31^{35f.}$ 33^{25}: and (חק) 28^{26} and ? Ps. 148^6. *EBi.* 2989, giving to חקה a sense not elsewhere found, though not difficult to derive from the root meaning *to inscribe*, renders *the pictures of the heavens*, understanding these to be the signs of the Zodiac.—b. Under God (Gn. 1^{16}), the heavens rule the earth.

34. **The clouds**—does Job make them give rain? The same subject is continued in [37f.]; cp. also [25-28]. Whether both [34] (which Bi. omits: [34b] = 22^{11}) and [37f.] were original, and, if so, whether they were originally separated by [35f.] may be questioned.—*Cover*] 𝕲 *answer*: but see phil. n.

35 Dost thou send forth lightnings that they may go,
And say unto thee, "Here we are"?
36 Who hath put wisdom in the . . .?
Or who hath given understanding to the . . .?
37 Who counteth the clouds by wisdom,
Or who tilteth the water-skins of the heavens,
38 When the soil becometh hard as metal,
And the clods cleave fast together?

---

35. **Lightning**: cp. ^{25b}. With the phrasing of ^{a} cp. Bar. 3^{33} (of light), of ^{b}, Bar. 3^{35} (of stars).

36. The terms left untranslated have been the subject of many guesses (see phil. n.). (1) If the v. is in its original context, it should refer to *celestial phenomena*: so, *e.g.*, RVm. *dark clouds* in ^{a}, *meteor* in ^{b}, the thought then being that such phenomena "from their movements and the figures they assume . . . are apparently endowed with intelligence" (Dr.). (2) In another context the questions might refer to the origin of *man's* wisdom; but if the terms really mean *inward parts* (cp. Ps. 51^{6}) in ^{a} and *mind* (of man) in ^{b} (RV.), the v. is probably misplaced. (3) A third theory is that *animals* are referred to: the *cock*, according to an ancient theory, in ^{b}, *spinning* (spiders), perhaps, in ^{a}. If these animals were referred to as prognosticators of the weather, the reference would not be out of place in the context; but if as possessing some other form of wisdom, the v. would fall rather somewhere between 38^{39} and 39^{30}. That ^{a} refers to man, ^{b} to the cock (𝔙 al.), is quite improbable.

37. Rain (cp. ^{34}) for ^{38} the thirsty earth.—*Counteth*] or, emending, *spreadeth out*: but see phil. n.—*Tilteth the water-skins*] the clouds (^{a}) are in ^{b} pictured (cp. 26^{8} n.) as vast water-skins from which, when laid down or tilted, the water pours forth as rain.

38. *Soil*] עפר, 5^{6} n. 8^{19} n.—*Becometh hard as metal*] lit. *is cast*, or *poured into a casting* (as of metal); cp. "the earth (shall be as) iron," Dt. 28^{23}; "your earth as copper," Lv. 26^{19}. Du. Peake interpret the phrase of the powdery dusty earth turning, as the rain falls on it, into mud (Du.: clods, Peake); but see phil. n.

39 Dost thou hunt prey for the lioness,
    Or satisfy the appetite of the young lions,
40 When they crouch in dens,
    (And) sit in the thicket to lie in wait?
41 Who appointeth for the raven what he hunteth down,
    When his young ones cry unto God,
    (And) ⸢pipe⸣ for lack of food.

39–XXXIX. 30. Marvels of the animal world.

39–41. **Lions**, $^{39f.}$, and **ravens**, ^{41}: who secures that the young of these are fed? Job, as a man, would rather starve and destroy than sustain beasts of prey; but God in His wisdom so orders His world that all His creatures are sustained; cp. especially Ps. $104^{20\text{-}24}$.—*Lioness*] 4^{11b}.—*Young lions*] 4^{10b}.

40. Cp. 37^{8}.—*Crouch*] lie low: cp. 9^{13}, Ps. 10^{10}.

41. *For the raven*] cp. Ps. 147^{9}. 𝔐, differently pointed, may be rendered *in the evening*; in this case, ^{41} continues the subject of the lions, and the raven disappears. The comparative brevity of the treatment of lions and ravens, if both are dismissed in $^{39\text{-}41}$, is suspicious: so also is the tristich in ^{41}; but there are difficulties in the way of adopting the rendering *in the evening*: see phil. n.—*Pipe*] a term parallel to *cry* in ^{a}, and suitable to ravens, if ravens are the subject of the v., is more probable than *they wander* (𝔐), or *it*—the parent bird—*wanders*, as others conjecturally emend; see phil. n.

XXXIX. 1–4. **The rock- or wild-goat.**—The animal intended is generally understood to be *Capra beden*, Wagn. (*DB* ii. 195). "It is a shy animal, with a keen scent, and its coloration is so like that of the surrounding rocks, etc., that it is very difficult to see. It usually goes in small herds of eight or ten, and, when feeding, has a sentry on the look out for enemies" (*EBi.* 1743): see, further, Tristram, *Fauna and Flora of Palestine*, p. 6 (with coloured plate). The rocky (1 S. 24^{3}) mountain haunts of this animal, inaccessible to or at least unfrequented by man (Ps. 104^{18}), impressed alike the author of Ps. 104 and of this passage. When they give birth, these creatures in their mountain retreats are beyond man's observation and care, but not God's: He has given to them

XXXIX. 1 Knowest thou ˬ the rock goats?
Or dost thou observe the calving of the hinds?
2 Dost thou count the months that they fulfil?
Or dost thou ⌜appoint⌝ the time when they bring forth?
3 They bow down, they give birth to their young,
They let go that wherewith they were pregnant.
4 Their young ones are healthy, they grow up in the open;
They go forth, and return not again.

---

to bring forth with ease (3), and to their young to grow up healthily, and quickly to become independent (4).

1. *Knowest thou*] do you take thought and care about: for the force of *know*, cp. 9^{21} n. 𝕳 + *the time of bringing forth of*. Some prefer to read, *Knowest thou the time of the wild goats*, *i.e.* the time or season of heat in the *males*; see phil. n.—*The hinds*] here the females of the wild goats (cp. Ps. 29^{9}).

2. *The months that they fulfil*] the period of their pregnancy. —*Appoint*] 𝕳 *know*.

3. *They bow down*] 1 S. 4^{19}. The v. describes the rapidity and ease of the parturition. Rabbinic interpreters understood it of difficult parturition; on both Rabbinic and classical stories about the parturition of the wild goats, see Bochart, *Hieroz.*, lib. iii. c. 17.—*That wherewith they were pregnant*] EV. al. *their sorrows*, (lit. "birth-pangs"), *i.e.* the young as the cause of their pains; with which it has become customary to compare Ovid, *Her.* 11. 111, "Nate, dolor matris." Cp. also the addition in 𝕲 in 2^{9} "sons and daughters the pains and sorrows of my womb." But see phil. n.

4. *Again*] lit. *for themselves*; or *unto them*, *i.e.* the herd.

5–8. The wild ass.—God (6), not man, who would rather have kept it in bondage, has given to the wild ass, now the most elusive and least tameable (11^{12} n.) of creatures, its freedom (5); and made the open country far from human dwellings, not some human master's stable such as housed its domesticated brother (Is. 1^{2}), its home (6); and given it a contempt for man's angry shoutings such as compelled the domestic

5 Who hath let the wild ass go free?
    And who hath loosed the bands of the brayer?
6 Whose home I have made the steppe,
    And whose dwelling-places the salt land.
7 He laugheth at the tumult of the city,
    He heareth not the shoutings of the taskmaster;

---

ass, most widely used of all beasts of burden, to work in servitude to man (7), and fleetness of foot to find its food over wide stretches of country (8). References to the wild ass, especially to its fleetness, intractability, shyness and avoidance of the haunts of men are frequent in the OT. (see 11^{12}, Gn. 16^{12}, Hos. 8^{9}, Is. 32^{14}, and references in the following nn.), and even more so in the Arabic poets (see Ahlwardt, *Chalif Al-Ahmar*, 341–360; Nöldeke, *Beiträge zur arabischen Poesie*, 143, n. 1, and *Fünf Moʿallaqât*, ii. 72 ff.); for various ancient references see Bochart, *Hieroz.*, lib. iii. c. 16; and for a modern account of the wild ass of the Hauran, Wetzstein in Del.

5. *Wild ass . . . brayer*] the two terms are used for the sake of parallelism, and do not refer to different species. Neither, like the English translation in ª and the Arabic *himâr alwaḥš*, defines the animal by its similarity to the domestic ass (*ḥᵃmôr*); but the first (*pere'*: cp. Ar. *farā*), which has already occurred in 6^{5} 11^{12} 24^{5}, probably means etymologically the fleet(-footed), the second the brayer, or less probably the fleer away (viz. from man: see phil. n.).—*Let go free*] released from captivity; cp. Dt. 15^{12}, Is. 58^{6}.—*The bands*] such as kept the domestic ass in servitude to man.

6. The home of the wild ass is in uncultivated country far from the dwellings of men (Dn. 5^{21})—in the wilderness (24^{5}, Jer. 2^{24}, Sir. 13^{19}: cp. *ὄνῳ ἐρεμίτῃ*, c. 11^{12} 𝔊, Jer. 31^{6} 𝔊), the steppe (24^{5}), the salt-land.—*The salt land*] uninhabited country (Jer. 17^{6}), unfit for cultivation (Ps. 107^{34}; cp. Jg. 9^{45}); a secondary reason for the use of the term here *may* be that as a graminivorous animal (8), the wild ass is fond of salt.

7. *He laugheth at*] has no fear of; cp. $^{18.\,22}$ 41^{21} 5^{22}.—b. Cp. 3^{18} n.

8. The wild ass must search far and wide for the green

8 He spieth out the mountains as his pasture ground,
And he searcheth after every green thing.
9 Is the wild ox willing to serve thee?
Or doth he spend the night over thy manger?

---

stuff on which it lives, but being fleet of foot finds it with an ease denied to the unfortunate human outcasts mentioned in 24^{5}.—*The mountains*] cp. Ps. $104^{10f.}$.—*Every green thing*] the food of the wild ass: cp. 6^{5}, Jer. 14^{6}.

9–12. **The wild ox.**—Ass and ox are constantly associated as domesticated animals and beasts of burden (Ex. 21^{33} $23^{4.\ 12}$, Dt. 22^{10}, Is. 1^{3} 32^{20}, Lk. 13^{15}); and so from his contrast of the wild (*pere'*) to the domestic ass (*ḥ^amôr*), the poet now passes to contrast the wild ox (*r^e'ēm*) with the domestic ox (*šôr*). The great strength of the wild ox (^{11}) might make him a suitable servant of man, if he would serve; but he will not (^{9a}): no manger (^{9b}) will entice him to tolerate servitude and to endure, like the domestic ox, being harnessed (^{10a}) to the plough or the harrow (^{10b}); but even if he would so submit, man would never have any confidence that his innate love of freedom and his strength would not make him break loose and cause loss ($^{11f.}$) to his employer.

9. *The wild ox*] that what was regarded, whether with zoological exactitude or not, as a wild *ox* of some kind is intended, is sufficiently clear from this passage alone: cp. the parallelism of the same Hebrew term (ראם) with ox (Dt. 33^{17}), cows (Is. 34^{7} פרים, unless we should there read פראים), calf (Ps. 29^{6}). Its dangerous (Dt. 33^{17}, Ps. $22^{22\,(21)}$), lofty (Ps. 92^{11}) horns accord with this. The Hebrew *r^e'ēm* is now commonly identified with the Assyrian *rīmu*, a wild bull hunted among other large game by the Assyrian kings (Tiglath-Pileser I. in *KB* i. 39), and depicted in enamel, alternately with dragons, on the great Ishtar Gateway of Babylon (cp. *KB* iv. 21). Reproductions of this representation are given in R. Koldewey, *Excavations in Babylon*, plates 26 (in colour), 27 and 30 (in colour), and R. W. Rogers, *History of Babylonia and Assyria*, i. 318. "Among the Assyrians it was often employed in metaphors of strength, and at times occurs in parallelism with *pîru*, elephant. Hence

10 Dost thou bind ⌜him⌝ to the furrow ⌜with⌝ cords?
Or doth he harrow the valleys after thee?
11 Would'st thou trust him, because his strength is great?
Or would'st thou leave to him what thou hast toiled for?

---

it is not improbable that the animal referred to is the Aurochs, the *Urus* of Julius Cæsar (*BG* 6. 28) . . . and the *Bos primigenius* of naturalists. Its teeth were found by Tristram in Lebanon, in the valley of the Nahr el-Kalb, which is just in the neighbourhood where Tiglah-Pileser I. (*c.* 1100 B.C.) claimed to have killed the *rimu*. . . . A similar animal is the wild cow or *wadiḥa* which, according to Doughty (*Ar. Des.* i. 328), may probably be the ראם. Though of no great size it has dangerous horns, measuring sometimes 23 inches . . . with which, when maddened with wounds, it will inflict fatal injuries" (*EBi.* 5229). An alternative name for the last-mentioned animal in the northern Bedawin dialects is *baḳar al-waḥš*, *i.e.* the wild cow, *wadiḥa*, denoting it as white. Doughty (*ib.* 327) gives an illustration of the horn. This animal is strictly an antelope (*ib.* 328), and, in particular, the *Oryx Beatrix*, Gray, an animal about 35 inches high at the withers, and of a prevailing dirty white colour with the long conspicuous horns already referred to. A coloured illustration of it is given in Sclater and Thomas, *The Book of the Antelopes*, iv. plate lxxxi. In Arabic the term *ri'm*, on the other hand, is given to quite another species of antelope, a graceful little gazelle, that does not correspond to the animal called *r*e*'ēm* in Hebrew, viz. *Gazella Marica*, Thos., depicted in Sclater and Thomas, *op. cit.* iii. lvi.; cp. Hess, in *ZATW*, 1915, 121–123.—*Manger*] Is. 1^{3}: cp. שור אבוס, Pr. 15^{17}.

10. *Him to the furrow with cords*] 𝔐 *the wild ox in the furrow of his cord.—After thee*] in harrowing (unlike ploughing) the animal must have been led.

11. No doubt the strength of the wild ox would be most useful to you; but suppose you could catch him and put him to work, would you *trust* him? See on $^{9-12}$.—*What thou hast toiled for*] the fruit of thy labour in the field (cp. 10^{8} phil. n.).

12 Would'st thou confide in him, that he would return,
⌈And⌉ gather ‸ thy seed ⌈to the⌉ threshing floor?

---

12. If you were to send the wild ox out to bring home your harvest, you would never expect him to come back.—*Seed*] in the sense of the matured product of the seed sown, corn-crop, as Lv. 27^{10}, Is. 23^{3}, Hag. 2^{19}.—*Return*] or (Qrê) *bring back*; on this and the emendation adopted above, see phil. n.

13–18. **The ostrich.** — There need be no doubt that the ostrich (𝔍) is the subject of these verses, though the earlier VV. did not recognize it, and the term used for the bird in [a] is strange (see phil. n.), nor that the cruelty ($^{14-16}$), and, if [17] be original, the stupidity also, commonly attributed to the bird (cp. Bochart, *Hieroz.*, lib. ii. cc. 14–17, and Schultens on this passage) are here referred to. But the first and last vv. of the passage ($^{13.\ 18}$) are obscure, and in consequence the exact point and reference of the entire description uncertain. According to one view of [13] there is an implicit contrast between the cruelty of the ostrich and the kindness of the stork: then the marvel, as in $^{5-8}$ and $^{9-12}$, consists in the striking differences between animals that in other respects closely resemble one another. Failing this, we must fall back for an explanation of the ostrich, though a bird, appearing in the midst of the quadrupeds, on the fact that it, like wild asses and wild oxen, is a notable inhabitant of the desert (see, *e.g.*, La. 4^{3}, Is. 13^{21} 34^{13}; Schult. 1118 top); or we may suppose that the section has been misplaced—Wr. places it after [30]—or, though this is much less probable than the preceding or following suggestion, that it has been separated from $^{26f.}$ through the interpolation of $^{19-25}$ (Ehrlich), or that it has itself been interpolated (Bi. Hatch, Du. Che. in *EBi.* 2481; cp. Di. Peake). Those who adopt the last view appeal in proof to 𝔊, from which $^{13-18}$ were absent, to the length of the section (six distichs as against four in the three preceding sections; yet $^{19-25}$ is still longer), the mention of God in [17], and the predominance of the directly descriptive over the interrogative mode of expression. If the section is original, ^{13a} as well as ^{13b} was probably interrogative; and the remainder of the

[13] Is the wing of the ostrich . . .,
Or . . . . . .;
[14] That she leaveth her eggs on the earth,
And warmeth (them) in the dust;
[15] And forgetteth that a foot may crush them,
And the wild beasts trample upon them?

---

section for the most part dependent on the question (cp. [6]): but, even if it were independent of the opening question, cp. [7f. 21-25. 28-30].

13. Schultens (cp. Bochart, *op. cit.* c. 16) was already able to collect twenty different translations or interpretations of this v., and this number could now be considerably increased. Many of these, including AV., can be ruled out as impossible; several remain from which an uncertain choice may be made. Probably [b] contained one, if not two terms, parallel to "wing" in [a]; whether it contained even (cp. [5]) one (AV.), not to say two (𝔗𝔍 Rashi), terms parallel, synonymously or antithetically, to "ostrich" is uncertain. In RV., "The wing of the ostrich rejoiceth; (But) are her pinions and feathers kindly (mrg. (like) the stork's)?," the renderings "rejoiceth," "but" and "her" are all questionable; as is also (see above) the absence of interrogation in [a]. Less improbably, with two slight emendations, we may translate, Is the wing of the ostrich sluggish, Or is pinion and feather lacking (to her), That she leaves, etc. Wr. rendered, Does the wing of the ostrich soar aloft, Or is it strong on the wing like the hawk and the falcon? Nay, it leaves, etc.; if such a contrast between the ostrich's eggs laid on the ground, and the hawk's ([26]) or the stork's (Ps. 104[17]) in lofty trees was the point expressed in the original text, 𝕳 requires more change than Wr. allowed himself to make in it (see phil. n.).

14-16. The cruelty of the ostrich: cp. "cruel as ostriches," La. 4[3].—If 𝕳 in [b] is correct, the v. refers to *two* actual habits of the ostrich, viz. that having laid its eggs in holes scooped in the sand, it [a] then leaves them (frequently during the early period of incubation and in the daytime to go in search of food), but [b] at other times (and continuously during the final periods of incubation) sits upon them to hatch them: but [b] in

16 She useth her young ones hardly, (making them) into none of hers;
Her toil is in vain: (there is) no fear.
17 For God hath made her to forget wisdom,
And hath given her no share in understanding.
18 What time she spurreth herself (?) on high,
She laugheth at the horse and his rider.

---

this case forms a bad introduction to [15], and we should probably read in [b] *depositeth them* (see phil. n.) for *warmeth*; then in [a] we may render by the stronger word *abandoneth* (cp. Jer. 14^{5}); and the whole v. refers to a single striking habit of the bird, viz. that it lays its eggs not high up out of danger, but on the ground, and leaves them there ([15]), exposed to the risk of any man or beast that may pass by.

16. The v. is a reflection on such habits of the ostrich as that in addition to the eggs laid and concealed in the sand for hatching, it lays others which it leaves exposed in the sand and uses for the nourishment of the chicks; and that "when the ostrich is surprised with her brood she runs away from her chicks" (Post in Hastings' *DB* iii. 635).—*Her young ones*] the unhatched birds.—b.[a] cp. Is. 65^{23}.—*Her toil*] in laying and in sitting on her eggs.—*There is no fear*] "she is unconcerned about it" (Dr.).

17. The stupidity of the ostrich: cp. the Arabic proverb, "stupider than an ostrich" (see Bochart, *op. cit.*, who cites many ancient testimonies to its stupidity). The v. in giving the reason for the cruelty described in [14–16], so far blunts that charge; and it stands awkwardly before [18], which suggests wisdom rather than stupidity. Since also the v. mentions God (cp. $40^{9.19}$), it is perhaps an addition (cp. Peake). In lacking wisdom, the ostrich lacks what was not confined to man, but found also in animals ($12^{7f.}$, Is. 1^{3}, Jer. 8^{7}, Pr. 6^{6}), and in some pre-eminently (Pr. 30^{24}).

18. The speed of the ostrich: "If helped by the wind, the fleeing ostrich spreads its tail-feathers like a sail and with constant flapping of its outspread wings easily escapes its pursuers" (Wetzstein in Del.). To this habit the unknown

19 Dost thou give strength to the horse?
Dost thou clothe his neck with ⌜might⌝?
20 Dost thou cause him to quiver like a locust,
In the majesty of his terrible snorting?
21 ⌜He⌝ paw⌜eth⌝ in the valley, and rejoiceth;
In strength he goeth out to meet the weapons.
22 He laugheth at fear, and is not dismayed;
And he turneth not back away from the sword.
23 The quiver twangeth upon him,
The flashing point of the spear and the javelin.
24 Quivering and excited he swalloweth the ground,
And he standeth not still (?) at the sound of (?) the horn.

---

word rendered above *spurreth herself* is supposed to allude (see phil. n.).—*Laugheth at*] the slow and ineffective pace of her pursuers: cp. 7 n.

19-25. The horse, and in particular the war-horse; its excitement, eagerness and absence of fear as it carries its armed rider (23) into battle.

19. *Might*] a conjecture based on the parallel term. Guesses at the meaning of 𝔐 include *fear* (𝔊), *thunder* (AV.), *neighing* (𝔙), *quivering mane* (RV.); see phil. n.

20. Much in this v. is uncertain: see phil. n.—*Quiver*] cp. 24.—*Like a locust*] the comparison of the war-horse with a locust seems less natural than the reverse (Jl. 2⁴, Rev. 9⁷).

21. *The valley*] cp. "thy choicest valleys were full of chariots: and the horsemen," etc., Is. 22⁷: also, for valleys as battlefields or the sites of encampments, Gn. 14⁸, Jg. 7¹, Is. 28²¹.—*Rejoiceth; In strength*] 𝔐 *rejoiceth in strength*, which unduly limits the ground of the horse's joy: both sense and rhythm could well spare *in strength* altogether.

22. *He laugheth*] v.7 n.—*The sword*] of the enemy: this would form an excellent parallel term to "weapons" in 21b: the order of the lines may have been 21a. 22a. 21b. 22b.

24b. The translation is very uncertain, but on the whole preferable to the alternative: *he believeth not that*, or *when*, or *if* (there is) *the sound of the horn*. Possibly the line is merely

25 As often as the horn (soundeth), he saith, "Aha!"
And from afar he scenteth the battle,
The thunder of the captains, and the shouting.
26 Is it through thy understanding that the hawk taketh flight,
That he spreadeth his wings towards the south?

---

intrusive, and $^{24.\,25}$ originally consisted not of a distich and a tristich, but of two distichs: see phil. n.

25. He neighs out his delight when the horn, the military (Am. 3^{6}, Jer. 4^{19}) musical instrument, sounds an advance.—*The thunder of the captains*] if the phrase is correct, this must mean the orders of the military captains (Nu. 31^{14}, Is. 3^{3}) given in tones of thunder.—*Shouting*] or war-cry: cp. Am. 1^{14}, Jer. 4^{19}, Zeph. 1^{16} ("the day of the horn and the battle-shout").

26–30. The hawk and, at least in 𝔐, **the vulture.**—Birds have been previously mentioned—the raven (38^{41} 𝔐) and the ostrich ($^{13-18}$); here two further birds conclude this survey of the animal world. Is it through wisdom given to it by Job that a sure instinct leads the hawk southwards at the approach of winter, or, at his command, that the vulture (unlike the ostrich, ^{14}) places its nest high up out of reach, on those rocky fastnesses where it makes its home and from whence its keen and far-seeing eye detects its carrion (^{30}) food?

26. *The hawk*] נץ; in Lv. 11^{16}, Dt. 14^{15} † the term is generic for a class of birds including (למינהו) several species; birds of the Falconidæ class appear to be intended (Bochart, *Hieroz.*, lib. ii. c. 19; Tristram, *NHB*, p. 189 f.; Thomson, *Land and Book*, 326; *EBi.* and *DB*, *s.v.* **hawk**); some of these, as, *e.g.*, the lesser kestrel, migrate south in winter.—The allusion to migration (cp. Jer. 8^{7}) in ^{b}, is not to be eliminated by rendering *to the south-wind*, "in which case the reference would be to the strength of wing that enabled it to fly in the teeth of the south wind" (Peake after Du.), for this would surely require a stronger prep. than ל.

27 f. Du. (see phil. n.), Or is it at thy command that it maketh its nest on high, And hath lodging upon the crag of the rock? This removes the vulture, and makes the whole strophe describe the hawk. Du.'s emendations greatly improve

27 Or is it at thy command that the vulture mounteth up,
And maketh his nest on high?
28 Upon the rock he dwelleth and hath lodging,
Upon the crag of the rock and the fastness.
29 From thence he spieth out food;
Afar off his eyes behold it.
30 His nestlings also gulp down blood:
And where the slain are, there is he.
XL. 2 Will the reprover contend with the Almighty?
He that argueth with God, let him answer it.

3 And Job answered Yahweh, and said,

---

the parallelism, and one bird rather than two would be more according to the analogy of the other sections; on the other hand the habits described in $^{27-30}$ agree with those elsewhere associated with the vulture.

27. *The vulture*] 9^{26} n.—**b.** (with ^{28}), cp. Jer. 49^{16}.

28. *Crag*] Heb. *tooth*; cp. Dent Blanche, Dent du Midi.

29. The vulture and its prey; cp. 9^{26}, Hab. 1^{8}, Dt. 28^{49} (note "from afar"), Jer. 48^{40} 49^{22}: cp. Ezk. $17^{3ff.}$.

30a. Did Job endow the bird "with her terrible instincts, that show themselves at once in her young, which suck up blood"? Cp. also Pr. 30^{17}. Hrz. compares Aelian, *H.A.* 10. 14, *σαρκῶν ἥδεται βορᾷ καὶ πίνει αἷμα καὶ τὰ νεόττια ἐκτρέφει τοῖς αὐτοῖς.*—**b.** cp. Mt. 24^{28}.

XL. 1. Between 39^{30} and 40^{2} 𝔐, not 𝔊, inserts, And Yahweh answered Job and said, thus cutting off the conclusion (40^{2}) of Yahweh's speech in 38^{2}–39^{30} 40^{2}.

2. Very effectively the speech closes as it opened ($38^{2f.}$) with a challenge:—Will Job, who has taken upon him the part of reprover and admonisher of God (cp. 38^{2}), still carry on the dispute? if so, he must answer (cp. 38^{3}) the questions Yahweh has put to him, and explain the marvels of creation which have just been brought before him in 38^{4}–39^{30}; if he cannot do so, he has no right to criticize and reprove.

4f. (+, probably, 42^{2-6}). **Job's reply to Yahweh**: he admits without reservation that he cannot answer God's questions (^{4a}): he will therefore give up the rôle of critic (^{4b}),

4 Behold, I am too mean: what can I answer thee?
I lay mine hand upon my mouth.
5 Once have I spoken; but I will not ⌜do so again⌝;
Yea twice, but I will no further.
6 **Then Yahweh answered Job out of the storm, and said:—**

---

which he confesses he had several times assumed (^{5}). In contrast to his own weakness (40^{4}), he acknowledges the omnipotence of God (42^{2}); and, now that he has been challenged (38^{4}), he sees that he had spoken confidently of what really was beyond his comprehension (42^{3}); and this had been because his previous knowledge of God had been by hearsay; whereas his present knowledge is the outcome of direct vision; this vision, and new kind of knowledge, have led him to humility and repentance (^{6}) for what he had said in criticism of God, though the text and meaning of 42^{6} are by no means certain.

4. *Too mean*] unequal to the task.—b. Cp. 21^{5} 29^{9}.

5. *Once . . . twice*] *i.e.* more than once, several times: cp. 33^{14}.—*Do so again*] 𝔐 *answer.*

6–XLI. 26 (34). According to the present text ($^{6} = 38^{1}$) a second speech of Yahweh clearly begins with ^{7}; to this second speech Job then makes a second reply in $42^{2\text{-}6}$. But it is probable that in the original form of the poem Yahweh made only one speech (38^{2}–39^{30} 40^{2}), and Job only one reply and confession ($40^{4f.}$ $42^{2\text{-}6}$).

In favour of this conclusion there are weighty considerations: (1) Even as they now stand, unassociated with $42^{2\text{-}6}$, $40^{4f.}$ contain a confession, without any reservation, that Job has thrown up his case, and that he has nothing further to say; in other words, so far as Job is concerned, Yahweh's object in speaking is already achieved, and there is no need for him to deliver another speech; (2) after such a confession Yahweh's rebuke in $^{7\text{-}14}$ "comes perilously near nagging" (Peake): this objection could be slightly mitigated, but not removed, by merely omitting ^{7} and retaining $^{8\text{-}14}$ as a second speech; (3) the speech, if the descriptions of leviathan and behemoth be omitted (see below), is suspiciously short; and (4) though it treats of a new *subject*, it has no sufficient distinctness of *purpose* from the first speech; nor does it draw from Job a really distinct or different confession; Yahweh here refers (40^{8}) to Job's impugnment of His righteousness, and to His government *of men* ($^{11\text{-}13}$), whereas in 38. 39 He had spoken of His work *in Nature*; but this still leads up, as do 38. 39, to the powerlessness and ignorance of Job in contrast to the might and wisdom of God (^{14}); and

[7] Gird up thy loins like a mighty man:
I will ask thee, and declare thou unto me.
[8] Wilt thou even disallow my right?
Wilt thou condemn me, that thou mayest be justified?

Job's reply in 42^{2-6} offers no particular withdrawal of his impugnment of God's righteousness, but rather continues, and gives the reason for what he has already said in $40^{4.5}$; thus he specifically acknowledges the *might* of God (42^2), as in 40^4 he had recognized his own impotence, and he gives as a reason for the silence on which he is now resolved (40^{4b}), the humility to which the vision of God has brought him ($42^{5f.}$). Most of those who adopt the view that there is but one speech of Yahweh, include in this one speech, and that as its conclusion, 40^{8-14} (so Bi. Du. Peake); but it is more probable that that speech concluded with 40^2, and that 40^7–41^{26} should be looked on as a variant of the original speech of Yahweh; for (1) the forcible effect of the brief challenge in 40^2 is weakened by the addition of a few distichs presenting a new subject; (2) $40^{4f.}$ admitting Job's incapacity to answer and announcing his retirement from the argument, follows far better immediately on Yahweh's challenge to him to answer, and justify his argument if he can (40^2), than after $^{8-14}$; (3) if the poet intended to deal with the impugnment of God's righteousness, it is probable that he would have done so more nearly on the scale of his treatment of the divine wisdom and power in 38. 39; (4) if the speech of Yahweh dealt separately and concluded with the question of the divine righteousness, it would be strange that Job's confession should make no reference to it, but only to the might of God (42^2). Da. feeling this remarked (on 42^2), "Job does not, as might have been expected, acknowledge the divine righteousness"; but then proceeded very inconclusively to explain that "any one divine attribute implies all others. Omnipotence cannot exist apart from righteousness"; if this reasoning were valid at all, it would render Yahweh's second speech unnecessary.

7–14. As Job had questioned the justice of God's rule of the world, he is now ironically invited to assume Divine attributes, and rule it himself; since he cannot accept the invitation, and so gain by experience a knowledge of all that is involved, he has no right to criticize.

7. $= 38^3$.

8. *Disallow*] or, *make void* (15^4, Is. 14^{27}, Nu. $30^{9.13\,(8.12)}$).—*My right*] that which is my due (34^5, Is. 10^2), *i.e.* my claim that I rule the world justly? Or משפטי might mean *my right*, in the sense of the right, or justice, which I execute in the world (Di. Da.): wilt thou condemn me that thou mayest be in the right, in thy claim, viz. to have been treated differently?

9. *Arm*] the symbol of might, as 22^8n.; of God, Ps. 89^{14} and often.—*Thunder*] mentioned as an imposing manifesta-

9 Or hast thou an arm like God?
And canst thou thunder with a voice like his?
10 Pray, deck thyself with majesty and loftiness;
And array thyself with glory and state:
11 Shed abroad the overflowings of thine anger;
And look upon every one that is proud, and abase him:
12 Look on every one that is proud, (and) bring him low;
And pull down the wicked where they stand:
13 Hide them in the dust together;
Bind up their faces in the hidden (world):

---

tion of God's power (cp. 37^{2-5}).—There is a sudden transition here from the thought of God's justice to that of His *might*. The world is so large, the circumstances and situations of human life so infinitely varied, that none but an omnipotent Ruler could rule them all with perfect justice: "one, therefore, who does not possess God's might, must refrain from passing judgment upon God's justice" (Di.).

10-12. God challenges Job, if he really thinks he can rule the world even as well as, not to say better than God does, to assume His attributes of majesty and power, and to abase the wicked as God abases them.

10. *Deck thyself*] put on as an ornament (עֲדִי): so Hos. 2^{15}, Is. 61^{10} al.—*Majesty* (גאון)] of God, as 37^{4}, Ex. 15^{7}, Is. 24^{14} al.—*Loftiness* (גֹּבַהּ)] cp. 22^{12}.—*Glory and state* (הוד והדר)] the attributes of a king (Ps. 21^{6} 45^{4}); of God, Ps. 104^{1} 96^{6}.

11. *Shed abroad*] lit. *scatter*, or *disperse* (Pr. 5^{16}). The figure is that of an impetuous, overflowing stream: cp. to *pour out* wrath, Hos. 5^{10}, and often.—**b.** cp. Is. 2^{12}.—*Look upon*] lit. *see*: do, if thou canst, as I do, who merely see the wicked, and they are instantly brought down!

12a. = 11^{b}, except one word: the repetition, if original, was intended to give emphasis to the thought.—**b.** *Where they stand*] immediately, and on the spot.

13. The reference might be to some dark, underground cavern, used as a prison, such as that in which Azazel is confined in En. $10^{4f.}$ (bind Azazel hand and foot, and cast him into the darkness: and make an opening in the desert, which is in Dudâêl, and cast him therein. And place upon him rough and jagged rocks, and cover him with darkness, and let him

**14 Then will I also praise thee,
That thine own right hand can save thee.**

---

abide there for ever, *καὶ τὴν ὄψιν αὐτοῦ πώμασον, καὶ φῶς μὴ θεωρείτω*,—quoted by Di.), or, more probably, perhaps, to the dust of the grave in [a], and to the dark and hidden recesses of Sheol in [b].—*Hide them in the dust*] Is. 2^{10}.

14. If Job succeeds in a position in which (as his complaints imply) he deems God to have failed, God will acknowledge—not, indeed, that he is equal to Himself in all things, but that he has an arm like God's (^{9a})—that at least his own power is sufficient for the task which he has undertaken, and that he is able to wield effectively his sword for the punishment of evil-doers. The *hand*, *right hand* or *arm*, is said in Heb. to *save*, or *give salvation* (*deliverance*, *victory*) *to* a person, when, with none to help him, he himself triumphantly overcomes his foes; of men, Jg. 7^2 ("lest Israel vaunt themselves against me, saying, Mine own hand hath saved me"), 1 S. $25^{26.33}$, Ps. $44^{4\,(3)}$; of God, Is. 59^{16} and 63^5 (no one else could do anything, so "his own arm *brought salvation to* him"), Ps. 98^1.

15–XLI. 34 (26). Behemoth and Leviathan.—For various reasons it seems probable that the description of these two animals was not written by the author of 38 f.

(1) The descriptions are longer: the longest description in 38 f. extends to six distichs and a tristich; that of behemoth to ten, that of leviathan to thirty-four distichs. (2) Questions, so frequent throughout 38 f. and never intermitted for more than a few distichs (at most five, 39^{21-25}) at a time, are here entirely absent from twenty consecutive distichs in $41^{15-34\,(7-26)}$ and from nine or ten in $40^{15-23\,(24)}$. The questions that do occur are massed together in $41^{1-7.\,10f.\,13f.}$ (40^{25-31} $41^{2f.\,5f.}$). (3) The constant recurrence of questions in 38 f. serves to keep the sense that God is speaking vivid, and to give an accumulating urgency to the divine challenge to Job; in the prolonged absence of questions in, and the purely descriptive character of especially the close of, 40^{15}–$41^{34\,(26)}$, the force of the challenge expressed, as in 38 f., in 41^{1-11} (40^{25}–41^{3}) dies away, and it is easy to forget that God is speaking. (4) This effect is not prevented by the direct assertion of $41^{12\,(4)}$, which, if the text be correct, has no parallel in 38 f. (5) In 38 f. it is the habits, actions and temper of the animals, and especially what is striking or strange in these, that are referred to; in $40^{15ff.}$ descriptions of the bodily parts of the animal assume prominence (see especially 40^{16-18} $41^{12.\,15-22.\,30\,(4.\,7-15.\,23)}$). (6) Whether behemoth and leviathan are respectively the hippopotamus and the crocodile, in which case they are pre-eminently

Egyptian animals, or *mythical* monsters (see below), they contrast strikingly with the *actual* animals of *Palestine* described in 38 f. It is questionable whether much or any weight can be attached to (7) linguistic and stylistic differences: Di. detects such in Jordan (=a river) 40^{23}, leviathan 40^{25} (assuming that it differs in meaning from leviathan in 3^{8}), רסן 41^{5} (ct. 30^{11}), בל and מוט 41^{15}, בלי negativing the finite vb. 41^{18}, חת 41^{25} (ct. חתת 6^{21}); but both רסן and חת, even if in themselves significant, are textually doubtful; on the negatives, the most noticeable among the points adduced, and on מוט, see phil. nn. on $41^{15.18}$; on leviathan see the end of this introductory note; the use of Jordan in 40^{23} is no doubt remarkable, but there is no obvious opportunity for its use elsewhere in the book. Di. also alleges the style of $41^{7.12.15.18}$, but this is partly the result of textual corruption and for the rest inconclusive. In view of the indecisiveness of (7), it must no doubt remain largely a matter of taste whether the author of 38 f. is considered to be also the author of 40^{15}–$41^{34\,(26)}$ or any part of it, and whether there were originally two speeches of Yahweh or only one. But such a second speech as the present text offers, with its brief introduction (40^{7-14}) followed by these lengthy descriptions of two animals, with its small interrogative element and entire absence of challenge at the close, is certainly greatly inferior in conception to the first with its vivid, brief descriptions of several animals, its recurrent challenging questions, and its final question (40^{2}). To transfer the descriptions of behemoth and leviathan to the first speech, as some have proposed, merely mars the first without rendering the second speech thus reduced to great brevity (40^{7-14}) more probable.

A further question is whether the whole of 40^{15}–$41^{34\,(26)}$ is from the same hand. If not, it is safest to distinguish from the rest 41^{1-11} (40^{25}–41^{3}) which is mainly interrogative (and so in contrast to the rest which is almost entirely descriptive), and *possibly* treats of a *sea* monster in contrast to the *Nile* animals that form the subject of the rest. This passage (41^{1-11}) *might* then have originally formed part of the first or rather the only speech of Yahweh. Others have distinguished (1) the description of leviathan ($41^{12-34\,(4-26)}$) from (2) the description of behemoth and the interrogations about leviathan (40^{15}–$41^{11\,(3)}$), attributing the whole of (2) to the author of 38 f.: so, *e.g.*, Stuhlmann; see also the discussions by Bu. (on 40^{15}–41^{26}) and Ku. (*Hist. Crit. Onderzoek*, iii. § 101, n. 17).

The identifications of behemoth and leviathan with the hippopotamus and the crocodile respectively are now commonly accepted: the only modern competing theory is that which, reviving in a fresh form ancient Jewish interpretations (En. $60^{7-9.24}$, Apoc. Bar. 29^{4}, 4 Es. 6^{49-52}: see also references, *s.v.* ליותן in Levy, *NHWB*) sees in these beasts mythical monsters described partly on the basis of mythological tradition, partly by means of traits derived from the hippopotamus and the crocodile (Che. *EBi.* 2483): see Che. *Job and Solomon*, 56, and *Behemoth and Leviathan*, in *EBi.*; Toy, *Judaism and Christi-*

[15] Behold, now, behemoth, which I made with thee;
Grass, like the ox, doth he eat.

---

anity, 162 f.; Gu. *Schöpfung u. Chaos*, 57, 61 ff.; and for a full and keen criticism of the theory, Bu. The supposed mythical traits are found mainly in the interrogative passage (41^{1-11} (40^{25}–41^{8})), though not exclusively, for Che. and Gu. find such also in $40^{19.\ 24}$ $41^{25\ (17)\ 31-34\ (23-26)}$, and especially in the fact that both animals, though this so far as the hippopotamus is concerned rests precariously on 40^{24}, are represented as beyond the power of *men* to capture, whereas the ancient Egyptians hunted and captured both the crocodile and the hippopotamus. Yet this point cannot be pressed too far, for, as Bu. (on 40^{25}) has pointed out, the Egyptians themselves could speak rhetorically of the animals as unapproachable: so in a hymn of victory Amon-Re says of Thothmes: "The lands of Mitanni tremble under fear of thee: I have caused them to see thy majesty as a crocodile, lord of fear in the water, unapproachable" (Breasted, *Egyptian Records*, ii. 659). Possibly, however, those who put forward this theory are so far right that two distinct animals are described in 41^{1-34} (40^{25}–41^{26}). In the interrogative passage, which is dominated by the idea of the beast's invincibility, there is nothing, unless we should so regard 41^{7} (40^{31}), that points necessarily or at all strikingly to the crocodile, and one or two points (see on 41^{1}) seem inconsistent with it. We should, perhaps, distinguish (1) in 41^{1-11} (40^{25}–41^{3}) a description of a *sea*-monster, leviathan, which is implied in Ps. 104^{26} to be seen of sailors on the sea, but is more often mentioned with distinctly mythical associations (3^{8}, Is. 27^{1}, Ps. 74^{14}, En. 60^{7-9}, 4 Esd. 6^{49-52}, Apoc. Bar. 29^{4}), from (2) a description in $41^{12-34\ (4-26)}$ of the *Nile*-monster, the crocodile, which was never termed leviathan, but may have been mentioned by name in the rhythmically irregular and more or less corrupt opening v. of the description ($41^{4\ (12)}$).

15–24. Behemoth.—Its habits ($^{15.\ 20-23}$), bodily parts ($^{16-18}$), and avoidance of capture (^{24}).

15. *Behemoth*] apparently the pl. of the common Hebr. term for beast with intensive force—*the great beast*—here applied to a particular animal which may, on the strength of the details

23

16 Lo, now, his strength is in his loins,
And his force is in the muscles of his belly.

---

given, especially of its amphibious character ([21f.]), be identified with the hippopotamus (so most since Bochart, *Hierozoicon*, lib. v. c. 15). On the possibility and extent of mythical elements in the description see above, and the notes that follow. Schultens, himself inclining to the elephant, records and criticizes a number of other identifications, mostly ridiculous, such as the worms feeding on Job's body, the domesticated ox, or, allegorically, the Devil or Christ. The hippopotamus, even if in the time of the author found outside Africa, and the crocodile were probably mainly thought of by the author as the two most conspicuous animals of Egypt and the Nile: cp. Herod. ii. 68–71, where the hippopotamus is described immediately after the crocodile: Diod. i. 35; Pliny, *HN.* viii. 95. "At the present time the river-swine (as the ancient Egyptians called them) [*i.e.* the hippopotamus] do not extend north of Dongola, between the second and third cataracts, and even there they are rare; but both the frescoes and writings of the Egyptians and the fossil remains found in the Delta of the Nile show that in former times it inhabited Lower Egypt, and was harpooned by the inhabitants. During the Pleistocene and Pliocene epochs an animal specifically indistinguishable from the hippopotamus was widely spread over southern and middle Europe, extending even into England, so that although at present there is no distinct evidence of its existing in the Jordan, it is possible that it may formerly have done so" (*EBi.* 2073).

15. *With thee*] *i.e.* like thee (9^{26} 37^{18}); both alike are God's creatures (cf. for the thought, 31^{15} 33^{6}). Or, omitting *which I made* with 𝔊, we may render *is beside thee* (see phil. n.).—*Grass, like the ox*] from its size and strength it might have been judged to be a carnivorous animal; but like other cattle it feeds merely on grass. The hippopotamus, especially at night, issues forth from its reedy ferns and "treading its way into the cultivated lands, makes sad devastation among the growing crops" (Wood's *Mammalia*, p. 762).

16–18. The immense strength of the animal.

17 He bendeth his tail like a cedar:
The sinews of his thighs are knit together.
18 His bones are tubes of bronze;
His limbs are like bars of iron.
19 He is the first of the ways of God:
Let him that made him bring near his sword!

16a. Not very distinctive, since the loins in general, or at least in men, were proverbially the seat of strength (Nah. 2^{2}, thy loins ‖ thy power, Ps. $69^{24\,(23)}$, Dt. 33^{11}; cp. Latin *delumbare, to weaken*); on the other hand, **b.** *the muscles of the belly* in the hippopotamus are said to be peculiarly thick and strong; and, unlike the elephant (1 Macc. 6^{46}; Jos. *Ant.* xii. 9^{4}), for example, it was not peculiarly vulnerable in the belly.

17a. A hyperbolical description of its tail. This is short, similar to that of a pig, hairless, very thick near the root, about the thickness of a finger at the end; its muscular stiffness, regarded apparently as indicative of strength, forms the point of its comparison to a cedar.—*Are knit together*] intertwined, so as to form a compact mass of muscle. Perhaps (Del.) there is in ישׂרגו an allusion to a closely intertwined bunch, or cluster, of vine-tendrils (cf. שָׂרִיג, a *cluster of tendrils*, Gn. $40^{10.\,12}$ [EVV. *branch*]).

18. *Tubes of bronze*] so strong and firm are they.—*Limbs*] or perhaps, strictly, *bones*: see phil. n.

19. Cp. in the description of leviathan, $41^{33f.\,(25)}$.—*First*] or, *chief*; ראשית, lit. *first, beginning*, may denote either what is first in *time*, as the "*beginning* of wisdom," Ps. 111^{10}, or *first season* (of a tree, Hos. 9^{10}), or what is first in *rank*, as Am. 6^{1} the *chief* of the nations, v.^{6} the *best* of unguents. *Ways* mean here the creative work of God: cf. 26^{14}, and especially Pr. 8^{22} "Yahweh got me (Wisdom) as the *beginning of his way*(*s*: 𝔊 Σ 𝔙)." Is "first," now, here to be taken in the sense of first in time (Gu. *Schöpf. u. Chaos*, 62)—according to Jewish Haggadah, Behemoth was not created until the 5th day (Bar. 29^{4}, 4 Esd. 6^{50})—or (Del.) first in rank, "the most majestic work of creation, *un chef d'œuvre de Dieu* (Bochart)"? "Perhaps (Hrz. Di. Bu. Du.) both ideas are to be thought of: behemoth was the masterpiece of God's creative work,

**20 For the mountains bring him (their) produce;
All the beasts of the field do play there.**

---

because (Hrz.) His full, fresh creative force had embodied itself in it (cp. the expression ר׳ אֹנִי, Gn. 49^{8} al. 'the *first* (or *firstfruits*) *of my* virile *strength*,' of the firstborn, regarded at the same time as the fullest representative of his father's physical nature). 'As mythology peopled the primaeval times with giants, it is natural they should look on huge beasts like the hippopotamus as remnants of such times' (Wr. 192)"—Dr.—*God*] in a speech of Yahweh: cp. [9] 39^{17} (perhaps interpolated).—*Let him that made bring near his sword!*] viz. to assail him; for no one else can do so. This is the only meaning which 𝔐 can have; but it is not satisfactory: in particular, it anticipates [24] and it gives no reason for the following *For* ([20]). The conventional rendering is, "He that made him *bringeth near* his sword" (fig. for his powerful teeth), *i.e.* furnishes him with it: but this, though it satisfies the following *For* (see on [20]) is for other reasons still less satisfactory (see phil. n.). The emendation (Che. after Du.), *which is made to be ruler of his fellows* (*i.e.* of the other animals), is attractive and *may* be right. 𝔊 suggests *which is made for him to play with* (cp. Ps. 104^{26}), *i.e.* to be God's plaything. Gu. very precariously, *which was made that he should rule the dry land*, cp. En. 60^{7-9}, 4 Esd. 6^{49-52} (Behemoth created lord of the desert; Leviathan, lord of the deep).

20. *For the mountains bring him* (their) *produce*].—So 𝔐. "For," however, agrees only with the conventional rendering of [19] just mentioned (it requires such a weapon; *for* it needs abundant vegetation for its nutriment), which (see phil. n.) is far from satisfactory; Du.'s emendation, "For the produce of the mountains *he* taketh to himself," gives a better sense. *Produce*, as 20^{28}, Lev. 26^{4}, Ps. $67^{7(6)}$ al. (EVV. usually *increase*). "Mountains" in Egypt are, however, at some distance from the Nile, and also bare: probably smaller cultivated heights, near the river itself, are meant. The thought of the line is, not that the animal feeds on mountains as opposed to plains, but that whole tracts of wooded and grassy heights are depastured

21 Under the lotus trees he lieth,
In the covert of the reed, and the swamp.
22 The lotus trees screen him as his shade;
The poplars of the wādy compass him about.
23 Behold, if a river ⸢overflow⸣, he is not alarmed,
He is confident, though Jordan burst forth against his mouth.

---

by him.—b. The line according to the existing text suggests the harmlessness of the animal: huge as it is, it does not assail other creatures; they can play fearlessly beside it. Gu. (see phil. n.) suggests that the original text expressed the subjection of other animals to behemoth in some such form as *all the beasts of the field look up to him.*

21–22. Its favourite haunts: under the shade of lotus trees, or poplars, and among the reeds and swamps of the river's side. The "lotus" meant is not the water-lily called *Nymphæa lotus,* though this is common in Egypt, but the *Zizyphus Lotus,* a low thorny shrub, which (Wetzst.) loves warm and moist low-lying regions (*e.g.* the shores of the Sea of Galilee), and is common in N. Africa (cf. the λωτοφάγοι, *Od.* 9. 82 ff.; Hdt. iv. 177).

21. *The reed*] the papyrus: Is. 19^{6}, Ps. 68^{31} "the beast of the reed." Cf. Ammian. Marc. xxii. 15 (cited by Bochart): Inter arundines celsas et squalentes nimia densitate hæc bellua cubilia ponit.

22. *The poplars of the wādy*] so Lev. 23^{40}: cf. the "wādy of poplars" Is. 15^{7}: ערבים, also Is. 44^{4}, Ps. 137^{2} †. The Arabic equivalent is *gharab*: and branches of this, brought to Europe and examined, are found to belong to the *Populus Euphratica,* which is very common in Palestine, being found on the banks of the Jordan and all other rivers (*EBi.* iv. 5302). The "wādy" suggests Palestine rather than Egypt.

23. The animal may be asleep on the edge of the river, or even in the river itself, with just its eyes, ears, and nostrils above the water; but it can dive and swim; so even though the stream rises suddenly and dashes against it, it is not alarmed. In ᵇ (if *Jordan* is correctly read there) the imagery is derived from Palestine (cp. last n. end): even though Jordan, a rapid and impetuous stream, dashed against it, it would still

24 **Can any take him ⌜when he is on the watch⌝,**
Or pierce through ⌜his⌝ nose with metal teeth?

---

have no fear.—*Overflow*] in RV. "overflow" is a paraphrase: RVm. *be violent*, is a doubtful rendering (see phil. n.). Gu., also by a slight emendation, obtains *Falleth*, and then restores the whole v. as follows: Behold, if the river falleth, he is not alarmed; He is confident, though the stream burst forth—alike whether the Nile rises or falls, the hippopotamus remains unalarmed.—*Is alarmed*] Dt. 20^{8}, Heb. (EVV. *tremble*). The word implies hurry mingled with alarm: 1 S. 23^{26}, 2 S. 4^{4}, Ps. $48^{6\,(5)}$ 104^{7} (the waters "at the voice of thy thunder *sped in alarm*").

24. A very doubtful v.: by itself it would most naturally express the ease with which the animal is captured: this being impossible in the context, it has been often understood to mean, It cannot be taken like an ordinary land-animal: when it could see him, no one would be able to take it, nor can its huge nostril be pierced by metal teeth.—*Can any . . .?*] No interrogation is *expressed* in 𝔐; and it is not improbable that the v. was originally, like the rest of the passage, descriptive; it may have read, *No man can*, or similarly. Gu. surmises a mythological reference: *God taketh or took him*: see phil. n.—*Metal teeth*] "מוקש is not a 'snare' (EVV.), *i.e.* (Germ. *Schnur*, a *string*) a *cord*, or *noose*; but, as its fig. use in the sense of a *lure* to destruction suggests (Ex. 10^{7} 23^{33}, 1 S. 18^{21}, 'that they may be a *môḳēsh* to him, and that the hand of the Philistines may be upon him) the trigger, or metal tooth, on which the bait was placed which, when the animal touched it, was released either by the action of the animal itself, or (as in Egypt) by the fowler concealed near it, who pulled it by a string, so that the trap, or frame holding the net—see the illustration of an Egyptian trap-net in Dr. *Joel and Amos*, p. 157—closed upon the animal; or sometimes—as the present passage would suggest—pierced its nostril, and so secured it (Del.). Such an instrument might effectually capture smaller animals; but it would be useless against the huge, thick-skinned muzzle of the hippopotamus"—Dr. See Burney, *Judges* 40.

XLI. (XL.) 1 (25) Canst thou draw out leviathan with a fish hook?
Or press down his tongue with a line?

XLI. 1–34 (XL. 25–XLI. 26).—Leviathan: Can Job capture leviathan? [1-8]. If not, how stand before God? [9-11] (but the text, meaning, and connection of [9-11] are uncertain). In [12-34] there follows a description of, in all probability, the crocodile. Whether this animal is also the subject of [1-11] is less certain (see above, p. 353). In describing the crocodile after the hippopotams, the writer probably had at least mainly in view the crocodiles of the Nile (cp. [31 (23)] n.), not crocodiles of the streams flowing into the Mediterranean south of Carmel, even if crocodiles at the time were found in any of the streams of Palestine. The OT. never refers to crocodiles in Palestine, though it is commonly inferred, from the names *Κροκοδείλων πόλις*, attaching to a town between Ptolemais and Straton's Tower (Strabo, 16. 27), and Crocodilon (Pliny, *HN.* 5. 17), attaching to a stream generally identified with the Nahr ez-Zerḳa, which flows into the Mediterranean south of Carmel and north of Cæsarea, that crocodiles existed in Palestine at least as early as these writers. Several mediæval writers speak, mainly on hearsay, of crocodiles especially in the stream north of Cæsarea (see Tobler, *Dritte Wanderung nach Palästina*, 375 ff.), and the presence of crocodiles, particularly in the Nahr ez-Zerḳa, has been reported by many modern travellers (see *Memoirs of the Survey of Western Palestine*, ii. 3; H. B. Tristram, *Fauna and Flora*, 155; Conder, *Palestine*, 70; Macgregor, *The Rob Roy on the Jordan*, 432 f. (who also claims to have seen a crocodile in the Kishon, *ib.* 447 ff.); *PEF Qu. St.* 1887, p. 1), and the skin of a crocodile said to have been killed in this stream is in the possession of the PEF (see *Qu. St.* 1893, pp. 183, 260). See more fully *PEF Qu. St.* Oct. 1920.

XLI. 1 (40^{25}). Can leviathan be taken by an ordinary hook and line?—*Leviathan*] a term with mythological associations (3^{8} n.), and never, presumably, the current Hebrew term for the crocodile, but here, if throughout down to [34] the same animal is referred to (yet see above, p. 353), applied to the crocodile to which the details in [12-34] so strikingly point that, with the

exception of Schultens, who still inclined to identify the animal described with the whale, most since Bochart have acquiesced in the identification, even those who argue for a mythical character of both behemoth and leviathan agreeing that elements in the description in $^{12\text{-}34}$ are taken from the crocodile.—*Or press down*, etc.] this has been explained as meaning that when the hook is swallowed and the cord drawn tightly, it presses down the tongue (Di. Da.). But the language is strange (see phil. n.). Du. Peake take the line to refer to leading about the animal, after capture, by means of a rope fastened round the tongue and lower jaw; and they find the idea carried on in ^{2}. In this case ^{1b} and ^{2b} have probably changed places; note that the more closely parallel terms *line* and *cord*, *fish hook* and *hook* would by such a transposition be associated in the same distich; ^{2b} in this case refers to what is done before capture: cp. Ezk. 29^{4}.—*His tongue*] this reference is not favourable to the identification of *leviathan*, $^{1\text{-}8}$ (as distinct from the animal described in $^{12ff.}$) with the crocodile: for Herodotus (ii. 68) records a widely prevalent popular opinion when he remarks of the crocodile that "unlike all other beasts, he grows no tongue"; similar statements (collected by Bochart, *Hieroz.* v. 16) are made by Aristotle, Plutarch, Pliny, and Ammianus and others. The difficulty cannot be satisfactorily avoided by pleading that as a matter of fact the crocodile has a tongue, though it is immobile and adheres to the lower jaw; for the question is not what is known to modern and some ancient (see Bochart) correct observers of the crocodile's anatomy, but what was the popular opinion in the age of the writer; it is possible, though not probable, that the Jewish author of this passage did not share the opinion current in Egypt, carried home thence by Herodotus, who was probably nearly contemporary with him, and accepted by Aristotle. Peake very rightly rejects another explanation, remarking, the line hardly means "you cannot press down his tongue, for he has none; but rather you cannot press down his tongue, for he is too formidable to be attacked." But would a writer so speak of the tongue in reference to an animal popularly believed to have none? 𝔐 (see phil. n.) admits of being rendered *into his teeth*; but

2 (26) Canst thou put a cord into his nose?
Or pierce his jaw through with a hook?
3 (27) Will he make many supplications unto thee?
Or will he speak soft words unto thee?

---

this rendering involves an improbable construction, and the text probably refers, as most have assumed, to the tongue. There is another consideration unfavourable to the identification of the beast described in $^{1-8\,(11)}$ with the crocodile: Herod. (ii. 70) describes the method of capturing crocodiles as follows: "A man puts the back of a pig upon a hook as bait, and lets it go into the middle of the river, while he himself upon the bank of the river has a young live pig, which he beats: and the crocodile hearing its cries makes for the direction of the sound, and when he finds the pig's back swallows it down; then they pull, and when he is drawn out to land," etc. Now, as already remarked, though crocodiles were captured, even the Egyptians could speak of them rhetorically and in general terms as unapproachable; but is it natural to ask incredulously *in detail* whether that was done which was done, or at least was believed by such a traveller as Herodotus to have been done?

2 (40^{26}). Can it, after capture, be treated like other fish? The reference may be either to the method of carrying fish when caught, cp. the illustration in Wilkinson, *Ancient Egyptians*, ii. 118 (190), or (Del.) to the practice of passing a cord through their gills, and letting them down into the water again, to keep them fresh; or there may be an allusion to the custom of leading about a bull or wild animal with a cord and ring (see on ^{1}).—*Cord*] lit. a *rush* ($41^{12\,(20)}$, Is. 58^{5}), *i.e.* a cord either made of rushes, or spun of rush-fibre: cf. σχοῖνος and σχοινίοι. —*Hook*] חֹחַ is properly a *brier* (2 K. 14^{9}), then a *thorn* (Pr. 26^{9}), and fig. a *spike* or *pointed hook* for holding captives; cp. 2 Ch. 33^{11}, and they caught (and held) Manasseh (בַּחֹחִים) with hooks: and so (חַח) Ezk. 19^{4} 29^{4}, and Is. 37^{29}, I will put my hook in thy nostril: cf. the representation on a stele in the British Museum of Esarḥaddon holding Tirhakah of Egypt and King Baal of Tyre, who are kneeling before him, by two cords, with rings at their end passed through their noses (Pl. 40 in Rogers, *CP*).

4 (28) Will he make a covenant with thee,
That thou shouldest take him for a servant for ever?
5 (29) Wilt thou play with him as with a bird?
Or wilt thou bind him for thy maidens?
6 (30) Will the companies (of fishermen) bargain over him?
Will they divide him among the merchants?
7 (31) Canst thou fill his skin with barbed irons,
Or, his head with fish spears?

---

3 (40^{27}). Will he *beg* to be spared or treated kindly?

4 (40^{28}). Will he consent to make an agreement with thee to be thy servant as long as he lives, receiving in return his food from thee?—*Covenant*] as Gn. 31^{44}, 2 S. 3$^{12.13}$ etc.—*A servant for ever*] *i.e.* to the end of his life: so Dt. 15^{17}, 1 S. 27^{12}.

5 (40^{29}). Can Job play with him as a bird, or keep him in his house as a pet for his maidens? Bochart and others compare Catullus' "passer deliciæ meæ puellæ."

6 (40^{30}). Is leviathan an article of traffic? Will fishermen make bargains (6^{27}) over him, or merchants be ready to take portions of it from them?—*Companies*] חברים is *associates*, *partners*: fishermen often worked in partnership; cf. Luke 5^{7} *κατένευσαν τοῖς μετόχοις ἐν τῷ ἑτέρῳ πλοίῳ*, ^{10} *οἳ ἦσαν κοινωνοὶ τῷ Σίμωνι*.—*Merchants*] lit. *Canaanites* (*i.e.* Phœnicians), these being the principal "merchants" known to the Hebrews. Cf. Is. 23^{8}, Zech. 14^{21}, Zeph 1^{11}, Pr. 31^{24}, Ezk. 17^{4}.

7 (41^{31}). This v. might well refer to the crocodile: can spears pierce his sides so as to enter his flesh? But it would anticipate, so far as the reference to the shield-like scales is concerned, $^{15-17\,(7-9)}$, and, so far as the futility of weapons is concerned, $^{26-29\,(18-21)}$. If the reference is to a sea-monster, the meaning is: as he is not to be captured with hook, so he is not to be slain by spears, for ^{8} no one assails leviathan with impunity: it is the assailant, not leviathan, that in such a case would suffer.—*Fish spears*] or, *harpoons* only here; lit. a *whissing* implement. Spears of various kinds were much used in ancient Egypt for fishing, and are often represented on the monuments. "The bident was a spear with two barbed points which was either thrust at the fish with one or both hands as they passed by, or was darted a short distance,

8 (32) Lay but thine hand upon him;
(Then) think of the battle; thou wilt do so no more!
9 (1) Behold, the hope of him (that assaileth him) proveth itself false;
Even at the sight of him ⌜he is⌝ prostrated.
10 (2) ⌜Is he⌝ not (too) fierce for one to stir him up?
Who, then, is he that can stand before me?

---

a long line fastened to it preventing its being lost, and serving to secure the fish when struck . . . sometimes a common spear was used for the purpose" (Wilk. B. ii. 121, cited in *EBi.* i. 1527: the line and net were, however, also used; see illustr., *ibid.* 115–117).

8 (41[32]). *I.e.* If thou merely layest thy hand upon him, the thought of the struggle thou wilt have with him will deter thee from ever doing so again.

9–11 (1–3). It is hopeless to expect to conquer in a contest with the monster ([9–10a]); who, then, can expect to stand in a contest with God? ([10b–11]). The thought of [10b–11], however, occasions difficulties, and it is very doubtful if the text throughout is correct. For mythological allusions found (after emendation) in these vv. by Gu. and Che., see phil. n. Me. and Du. consider the vv. not only in need of emendation, but also out of place; see on [12].

9. *Of him* (*that*), etc.] The pron., as happens sometimes in Heb. (see phil. n.), refers to the person whom the poet has in his mind, here the assailant.—**b.** The very sight of the monster will paralyse his assailant.—*He is*] 𝔐, impossibly, *is he?* EVV. silently emend by inserting *not*.

10a. Commonly rendered, "He (the assailant)—*or* (Del.), One—is not fierce (enough), that he should stir him up" (Di.): but אכזר is strictly *cruel* and is better, as above, applied to the animal (see phil. n.). The general thought is in both cases the same: no one dares to molest him.

11b. The sudden introduction of God here, without the least emphasis in the Heb. on *me* to suggest that a different reference is intended, agrees indifferently with the context; hence Gu. Du. Ehrlich, Honth. read the 3rd p. instead of the 1st. "Who, then, is he that can stand before *him* (*i.e.* Leviathan)? Who ever confronted *him*, and prospered?" "𝔐 is, however, attested (in

11 (3) Who hath ever confronted me, and prosper⌜ed⌝?
Under the whole heaven such a one is ⌜not⌝!

---

both words) by 𝕲; it is not apparent why, if the 3rd pers. stood originally in [10b. 11a], it should, after the 3rd pers. in [10a], have been changed into the 1st: and though 27 Heb. MSS and 𝕿 read *him* for *me* (לפניו for לפני) in [10b], this may be an error, due to faulty assimilation to 'stir *him* up' just before: the remaining Versions all read *me*, and there is no variant in either MSS or VV. in 'confronted *me*' in [11a]" (Dr.).—*Stand* (יתיצב) *before me*] the expression, as Dt. 7^{24} (בפני) 9^{2} 11^{25} (בפני), Jos. 1^{5}.

11. *Me*] or, emending, *him* (see on [10]).—*And prospered*] so, virtually, 𝕲: see phil. nn. pp. 335, 337.—**11a.** 𝕸 Whoever came before me, or to meet me (Mic. 6^{6}, Dt. $23^{5\,(4)}$) (*sc.* with a gift), *that I should repay* (it)? (so 𝖁, RV.); and the verse is alluded to in this sense in Rom. 11^{35} ἢ τίς προέδωκεν αὐτῷ, καὶ ἀνταποδοθήσεται αὐτῷ; This would be an indirect way of saying that no one has any claim against God, or ground of complaint against Him, such as Job had raised: man has given God nothing, so He owes no man anything. But the manner in which the thought that God owes no man anything is introduced, and the application made of it to the question what God owes man *morally*, are both improbable. For the form of sentence emended as above, see 9^{4}; for הקדים in a hostile sense, Am. 9^{10} †, and more usually קִדֵּם, Is. 37^{33}, Ps. $18^{6.\,19}$.—**b.** "(EVV. Whatsoever is) under the whole heaven is mine"; this is, of course, true in itself (Ps. $50^{10ff.}$), and would perfectly agree with [a], as read in 𝕸; but unfortunately there is no word in the Heb. for *Whatsoever*. The clause can only be rendered, "Under all the heaven it (*or* he) is mine." "It" has no antecedent: "he" is adopted by Bu., with the meaning, he (*i.e.* whoever under the whole heaven thus confronted me) is mine, cannot escape me. On the emended text followed above see phil. nn. p. 335 f.

12–34. (**4–26**). Description in detail of the bodily structure of the **crocodile**, and of the formidable powers with which it is endowed.

12. (**4**). The v. appears to be corrupt (see phil. nn.), and

12 (4) I will not keep silence concerning his limbs,
Or the account of ⌜his⌝ might, or the ⌜strength⌝ of his build.
13 (5) Who hath (ever) stripped off his outward garment?
Within his double ⌜coat-of-mail⌝ who can come?
14 (6) Who hath opened the doors of his face?
Round about his teeth is terror.

---

may perhaps in its original form have expressed a meaning radically different from the above, possibly in ª naming the crocodile. Me., placing 9–12 before 38[1], renders, I will not silently tolerate his (Job's) prattlings (11[3]) and the word of pride and his artificial (*künstliche*) speeches: Du., placing 9–12 after 40[24], renders, He (the assailant of behemoth) would never (again after a single conflict) renew his boastings, or his talk about valiant deeds and his practical outfit. But these renderings, though they involve no more extensive emendations than that given in the text above, strain the meaning of some of the words (see phil. nn.). It is unwise to use this v. to depreciate the literary skill of the author of the following description; this certainly does not reveal the same kind of genius as the brief descriptions in c. 39, but it is in its own way vivid and vigorous; in order to appreciate c. 39, it is unnecessary to depreciate 41[12ff.].—*Strength*] reading חיל (of physical strength, as 21[7], Ps. 18[33. 40 (32. 39)] 33[17]); 𝕸, perhaps, *grace* (see phil. n.); but the crocodile is not exactly remarkable for its gracefulness; and the point here is not the animal's comeliness, but its formidable character.—*Build*] lit. *arrangement*; see phil. n.

13 (5). *Stripped off*] גלה as Is. 22[8] (n.) 47[2].—*His outward garment*] the animal's scales.—*His double coat-of-mail*] *i.e.* the animal's scales (cp. *EBi.* i. 605) and hide: so 𝔊 Wr. Du. Be.. 𝕸 "his double *bridle*," which is interpreted as meaning his upper and lower jaws, each furnished with a powerful array of teeth. But "bridle" would be a strange term to use of either the jaws or the rows of teeth.

14 (6). *The doors of his face*] *i.e.* his upper and lower jaws. —b. The teeth of the crocodile, "in the upper jaw usually 36, in the lower 20, long and pointed, are the more formidable to look at, as there are no lips to cover them" (Di.).

15–17 (7–9). His armour of scales.

15 (7) r His back ¹ is (made of) channels of shields,
(Each) shut up closely, (as) a compressed seal.
16 (8) One is so near to another,
That no air can come between them.
17 (9) They take hold of one another;
They stick together, that they cannot be sundered.
18 (10) His sneezings flash forth light,
And his eyes are like the eyelids of the dawn.

---

15 (7). *His back is channels of shields*] The creature's scales are called fig. "shields"; each scale of the crocodile is a hard, horny, rectangular plate; they extend in rows along the animal's back, forming a strong protective covering, and the "channels" (6^{15} 40^{18}) are the spaces between these rows found by their sides (see the illus. in Wood's *Reptilia*, p. 29). The term "shields" is appropriate. "The plates which cover the skin of the crocodile are of exceeding hardness, so hard, indeed, that they are employed as armour by some ingenious warriors. A coat of natural scale armour formed from the crocodile skin may be seen in the British Museum" (*ib.*). And even modern zoologists call the scales "scutes" (i.e. *scuta*, shields); see the quotation given on v.^{23}.—b. The scales are firmly attached to the body: each is like a seal pressed tightly against the underlying surface. A seal, in the ancient East, was made of clay, sealed while it was soft, and hardened afterwards by burning. The rows of scales are like rows of seals, each of the same rectangular shape, and each pressed down firmly against the skin.

16-17 (8-9). How firmly the scales are attached to one another; no air can enter between them, and they are inseparable from each other.

18 (10a). The spray breathed through his nostrils, as he sneezes, flashes in the sunlight. The crocodile often lies, with its mouth open—looking towards the sun; and hence its tendency to sneeze: Cf. Strabo, xvii.: ἡλιάζονται κεχηνότες, and Ælian, *Hist.* iii. 11: Ἐπὶ τὴν ὄχθην προελθὼν κατὰ τῆς ἀκτῖνος κέχηνεν, cited by Boch. *Hieroz.* lib. v. c. 17.—b. *Like the eyelids of the dawn* (3^{9})] The allusion is apparently (Di.) to the reddish eyes of the crocodile, which appear gleaming through the water before the head appears above the surface. In the Egyptian hieroglyphics the dawn is denoted by the crocodile's

19 (11) **Out of his mouth go burning torches,**
(And) sparks of fire leap forth.
20 (12) **Out of his nostrils a smoke cometh forth,**
As of a boiling pot and rushes.
21 (13) **His breath setteth coals ablaze,**
And a flame goeth forth from his mouth.
22 (14) **In his neck abideth strength,**
And before him danceth dismay.

---

eyes: Bochart cites Horus, *Hieroglyph.* i. 65: *Ἀνατολὴν λέγοντες, δύο ὀφθαλμοὺς κροκοδείλου ζωγραφοῦσιν ἐπειδήπερ* (lege *ἐπειδὴ πρὸ*) *παντὸς σώματος ζώου οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ ἐκ τοῦ βυθοῦ ἀναφαίνονται.*

19–21 (11–13). A hyperbolical description of the spray, which, as the monster rises above the water after a long submergence, is expelled with some vehemence when its pent-up breath is released, and sparkles in the sunlight.

20 (12). *As of a boiling pot, and rushes* ([2](40[20]))].—The monster's breath is compared to steam issuing forth from a boiling pot, intermingled (if the text is correct) with the smoke of the rushes used as fuel and burning beneath it. But we should perhaps rather read: *as of a pot blown upon and boiling, i.e.* brought to the boil upon the fire: Wycliffe (after 𝔙) "as of a pot set on the fier and boilynge." *Smoke* must here be what we should call *steam.*

21 (13). The drops of spray, flashing in the sunlight, are compared to sparks thrown out by burning coal, and the stream of spray itself to a flame of fire.

22 (14a). The neck, mentioned between the conspicuous features in the head ([18–21]) and the body ([22. 30], originally, perhaps, consecutive vv.: see on [30–32]), is inconspicuous in the crocodile (see Bochart); and so here no description is given of its outward appearance.—*Before him,* etc.] cp. Hab. 3[5].—*Danceth dismay*] a beautiful and expressive figure, denoting the consternation which his approach occasions, which it is an injustice to the poet to emend away—especially into questionable Hebrew (see phil. n.). Boch. quotes Hes., after the description of the chariot of Ares, *παρὰ δὲ δειμός τε φόρος τε Ἕστασαν, ἱέμενοι πόλεμον καταδύμεναι ἀνδρῶν.*

23 (15). Even the "flakes," lit. *falling, i.e.* pendulous,

23 (15) The flakes of his flesh are joined together,
(The whole) firm upon him (and) unmoveable.
24 (16) His heart is as firm as a stone;
Yea, firm as the nether millstone.
25 (17) At his uprising the mighty are in dread:
By reason of consternation they are beside themselves.

---

parts of his body, under the neck and belly, which in most animals are soft, are in the crocodile firm and hard. "The skin of the *whole* body is scaly, with a hard, horny, waterproof covering of the epidermis, but between these mostly flat scales the skin is soft. The scutes or dermal portions of the scales are more or less ossified, especially on the back, and form the characteristic dermal armour" (*Encycl. Brit.* vii. 478^a).

24 (16). *His heart is as firm as a stone*].—"The firmness" meant is not merely physical firmness, but the staunch moral firmness, as shown in undaunted courage, of which the physical strength and firmness of the heart were often regarded by the ancients as the foundation: cp. how אמץ and חזק, each meaning to be *strong* or *firm*, are regularly applied to the heart to denote courage (*e.g.* Ps. 27^{14} "let thine heart be *strong*," i.e. *courageous*). Boch. (*op. cit.*) quotes from Elmacinus' *History of the Saracens*, the statement that after a certain warrior was dead, his heart was cut out, and found to be as "hard and compact as a stone."—*The nether millstone*] the Eastern domestic handmill used for preparing corn for daily use, consisted, as it consists still, of two circular stones, each about 18 inches in diameter, the lower one resting upon the ground, and the upper one having a hole in the centre to admit the corn being turned round upon it by a woman (Ex. 11^5), or sometimes (Mt. 24^{41}) by two women. The lower stone is always heavier, and often made of harder material, than the upper stone (cf. Jg. 9^{53}).

25 (17). When the monster prepares himself to fight, the bravest are in consternation.—*The mighty*] or *the gods*.—*By reason of consternation they*] the Hebr. is very questionable (see phil. n.); perhaps we should read *and at his teeth mighty men*: for this and other suggestions see phil. n.

26–29 (18–21). Every weapon the monster defies.

26 (18) Though the sword reach him, it doth not hold,
Nor the spear, the dart, nor the pointed shaft.
27 (19) He counteth iron as straw,
(And) bronze as rotten wood.
28 (20) The arrow cannot make him flee:
Slingstones are turned for him into stubble.
29 (21) A club ⌜is⌝ counted as a ⌜reed⌝;
And he laugheth at the rushing of the javelin.
30 (22) Beneath him are the sharpest potsherds:
He spreadeth (as it were) a threshing-drag upon the mud.

---

26 (18). *The dart, nor the pointed shaft*] the Heb. is uncertain: see phil. n.

28 (20). *Arrow*] Heb. *son of the bow*: cf. La. 3^{13} בני אשפה, sons of the quiver; and above, on 5^{7}.—*Slingstones*] cf. Zec. 9^{15}; also Jg. 20^{16} (cf. 1 Ch. 12^{2}), 1 S. $17^{40.\,49f.}$ 25^{29}. "The sling is a simple and, with practice, effective weapon, still in frequent use in Syria, Egypt (where I have seen it used myself), and Arabia. Cf. *EBi.* iv. 4659" (Dr.).

29 (21). *A reed*] 𝔐 "stubble," as $^{28\,(20)}$. The reed is a fig. of weakness: Is. 36^{6}, Ezk. 29^{6}.—*Laugheth*] cf. $39^{7.\,18.\,22}$.

30–32 (22–24). Description of the underpart of his body (^{30}), and of his progress through the water ($^{31f.}$). The verses would be more in their place after $^{24\,(16)}$, while conversely vv.$^{33f.\,(25f.)}$ would more suitably be immediately preceded by the description of the invincibility of the animal in vv.$^{25-29}$ ($^{17-21}$): possibly they have become accidentally misplaced. They are omitted by 𝔖; but that is no sufficient reason for questioning their originality.

30 (22). *Beneath him*] *i.e.* on the underpart of his body.—The allusion is to the scales of the belly, which, though less hard than those on the back (cf. on ^{15}), are still sharp, particularly those under the tail, so that, when the animal has been lying in the mud by the river-bank, they leave an impression upon it as if a sharp threshing-drag had been there. The same comparison to potsherds, at least of the scales of the *back*, is made by Ælian, *Hist.* x. 24 (cited by Boch.): *Τα νῶτα δὲ πέφυκε καὶ τὴν οὐρὰν ἄρρηκτος, λεπίσι μὲν γάρ τε καὶ φολίσι πέφρακται, καὶ ὡς ἂν εἴποι τις ὥπλισται, καὶ ἐοίκασιν ὀστράκοις καρτεροῖς.* The *threshing-drag* no doubt resembled the one, usually about 7 ft. long by 5 ft. broad, still in use in

31 (23) He maketh the deep to boil like a (perfume-) pan:
The sea he maketh like (seething) perfume.
32 (24) Behind him he maketh a path to shine;
One would think the deep to be hoary.

Syria, consisting of two oblong planks, fastened together by two wooden cross-pieces, slightly curved upwards in front (in the direction in which the instrument would be drawn), and set underneath crosswise with sharp pieces of hard stone or basalt: the driver stands upon it; and being drawn round the threshing-floor by oxen, it shells out the grain, and cuts up the straw into chaff. It is referred to in the OT. by the same name *ḥārûṣ* or *ḥārîṣ* (something "sharpened") in 2 S. 12^{31}, Am. 1^{3}, Is. 28^{27a}, and under the name *mōrāg* in 2 S. 24^{22}, Is. 41^{15} "Behold, I will make thee (Israel) as a *sharp* new *threshing-sledge*, possessing edges." See, further, Driver, *Joel and Amos*, p. 227 f. (where an illustration is given). The rendering (EVV.) "threshing-*wain*" (i.e. *wagon*) is unfortunate; for it does not at all suggest what the implement was like: the "threshing-*wagon*" itself (Is. 28^{27b}) being, moreover, of entirely different construction.

31–32 (23–24). The froth and foam which he stirs up, as he rushes through the stream, and lashes the water with his tail; and the shining track of white bubbles which he leaves behind him.

31 (23). *A (perfume-) pan*] *i.e.* a pan, or pot—"pan" is merely adopted for the sake of variety in the English such as there is in the Heb., in this v. as compared with v.$^{12 (20)}$—in which oil and other ingredients, being boiled together to produce an unguent or perfume (v.^{b}), yielded a white frothy foam: רָקַח and its derivatives include the ideas of *unguent*, *perfume*, and *spice* (Ca. 8^{2}, of spices mixed with wine). The "ointment" (EVV.) ^{b}, or perfume, of ^{b} must be thought of as a boiling *liquid*. Cf. Ex. 30^{25} (of the holy anointing oil, made of myrrh, cinnamon, aromatic reed, cassia, and olive oil), "a perfume of perfumery, the work of the perfumer," and 30^{35} (of the incense, compounded of spices, myrrh-oil, onycha, galbanum, and frankincense): also 1 S. 8^{13} female perfumers (or perfume-makers), Is. 57^{9} thy *perfumeries* or *unguents*. In his choice

33 (25) Upon earth there is not his like,—
That is made without fear.
34 (26) Every thing that is high ⌜feareth him⌝:
He is king over all the sons of pride.
XLII. 1 And Job answered Yahweh and said,
2 I know that thou art omnipotent,
And that no plan is impossible for thee.

---

of this particular figure for the *appearance* of the water after being lashed by the crocodile, the writer may have been influenced by the musk-like smell of the crocodile which, as Bochart showed, was frequently and widely observed.—*The sea*] *i.e.* the Nile (as Is. 19^{5}, Nah. 3^{8}), still called by the Arabs *el-Baḥr*, *i.e.* the *sea*.

32 (24). *Hoary*] שֵׂיבָה, as 1 K. $2^{6.9}$ al. Hrz. compares *Il.* i. 350, θῖν' ἔφ' ἁλὸς πολιῆς, and *Od.* iv. 405 (of seals) . . . πολιῆς ἁλὸς ἐξαναδῦσαι.

33 f. (25 f.). He has no rival, he fears no one and nothing, he is king over all proud beasts upon the earth.

33 (25). *That is made*, etc., the antecedent to "that" is not, of course, *his like*, but the pronoun to be elicited from "his." "He that is made without fear" would be clearer: but unfortunately it would also, as English, be ungrammatical.

34 (26). 𝔐 has, "Everything that is high he seeth," viz. unconcerned and unmoved: but the thought is weakly expressed; and Gu.'s emendation, while changing little, yields a much more forcible sense.—*The son of pride*] *i.e.* other proud beasts: so 28^{8}.

XLII. 1–6. In the present state of the text, [2–6] contain Job's reply to Yahweh's *second* speech (40^{7}–41^{34}), [1] being the ordinary introductory formula; but originally, as it would seem, [2–6] formed the conclusion (immediately following $40^{4.5}$) of Job's reply to Yahweh's *only* speech. See on $40^{4f.}$ and [6] (p. 348 f.).

2. Job acknowledges that God can achieve all that He plans, and that He plans knowing that He can do all things.—*Is impossible for*] lit. *is cut off from*: see phil. n.

3. a. b = 38^{2}, a marginal note. Dr. (*Book of Job*), treating it as an integral part of the text, remarks: "understand here, *Thou didst say truly*. Job repeats the question addressed to him

3 **Who is this that hideth the purpose (of God),**
⌜With words (spoken)⌝ without knowledge?
Therefore I have declared, without understanding
Things too wonderful for me, without knowing.
4 **Hear, I pray thee, and *I* will speak;**
I will ask thee, and do thou inform me.
5 By the hearing of the ear I had heard of thee,
But now mine eye hath seen thee.

---

in 38^{2}, for the purpose of admitting (lines 2 and 3 [= $^{c.d}$ above]) the justice of the rebuke implied in it."—c. Cp. $38^{4b.18}$. d. Cp. Ps. 139^{6}.

4. Cp. $21^{2f.}$ 33^{31}; $^{b} = 38^{3b}$. Like $^{2a.b}$ the v. is probably a marginal note; otherwise Dr.: "Job repeats, in line 1, the substance [merely abandoning the figure of battle, Di.], and in line 2 the actual words of God's challenge to him in 38^{3} ($= 40^{7}$), prior to confessing (v.^{5}) his inability to meet it, and retracting (v.^{6}) his former presumptuous utterances."

5. In speaking of the wonderful ways of God (^{3}) on the ground of what he had heard about God, Job now realizes that he had spoken unwisely and ignorantly; for there has now come to him through vision intimate first-hand personal knowledge of God, which does not indeed clear up for him all mysteries, but does show him that, if they are mysteries, they are the mysteries of one in the vision of whom there is peace and blessedness. Vision is here contrasted as direct personal experience of what a person is and does with hearing as knowledge at second-hand, knowledge of some other's experience or report of that person, knowledge which, even if not mingled with error, as was the traditional doctrine of God, which had been passed on to Job, must at best be blurred and indistinct; for the contrast, cp. $28^{21f.}$, Ps. 48^{9} (the stories of the fathers about God (cp. Ps. 44^{2}) verified by the direct sight, *i.e.* experience, of the present generation). The vision spoken of is not the sight of any form or appearance of God; for there is no indication that Job is conceived as having seen such, and. moreover, the sight of an appearance or outward form is just as far as hearing from giving direct, intimate, true knowledge (cp. Is. 11^{3}, 1 S. 16^{7}). What Job has seen, *i.e.* experienced,

6 Wherefore I repudiate (what I had said),
And repent, (sitting) upon dust and ashes.

7 And it came to pass after Yahweh had spoken these words to Job, Yahweh said to Eliphaz the Temanite, "My anger is hot against thee, and against thy two friends, because ye have not spoken concerning me what is right, as my servant Job

---

is just what he had wished to see (19[27]), viz. that God is not against him or estranged from him; and his wish has been more than fulfilled, for the vision has come to him before death.

6. The v. is probably corrupt, the words *I repudiate and repent* being uncertain and ambiguous (see phil. n.); and the phrasing of the v. rather tame and unsatisfactory.—*Upon dust and ashes*] 2[8]: the clause, if *repent* is rightly read, enforces Job's grief and penitence; cp. Is. 58[5], "Is this the fast that I choose . . . that (a man) should spread ashes": Jon. 3[6], "And the king of Nineveh . . . covered himself with sackcloth and sat on ashes."

7–17. The Epilogue recording (1) Yahweh's condemnation of the three friends, whom He exempts from the punishment due to their wrong speech about Him after, at His direction, they have obtained Job's intercession on their behalf; and (2) the restoration of Job to more than his former prosperity. If the whole of the Epilogue and Prologue are from one hand, that hand had lost its cunning before it reached the Epilogue; the repetition in [8b] of the clause in [7b] may indeed be a mere textual accident: if not, it is very different in character from the repetitions in the Prologue; but the contrast comes out more strongly in the absence of concentration and compression which contributes so largely to the effect of the Prologue. We may note especially the irrelevant particularity which gives the names of Job's three daughters, and the detail as to their inheritance ([14. 15]); and the detailed explanation in [12b] of the general statement in [10b].

7a. The last words spoken were Job's not Yahweh's, but the writer wishes to define the order in which Yahweh addresses Job and his friends, and so he refers to Yahweh's last words.—*Yahweh said to Eliphaz*] apparently not while Eliphaz was in

hath. [8] And now, take you seven bullocks and seven rams, and go to my servant Job, and offer up a burnt-offering on behalf of yourselves, and let my servant Job pray for you; for him will I accept that I deal not mercilessly with you; because ye have not spoken concerning me what is right, as my servant Job hath. [9] And Eliphaz the Temanite and Bildad the Shuḥite and Ṣophar the Na'amathite went, and did as Yahweh had said unto them. And Yahweh accepted Job.

[10] And Yahweh changed Job's fortunes, when he prayed on behalf of his friends: and Yahweh increased all that Job had

---

Job's presence, for it is necessary for Eliphaz and his friends to go to Job ([8]), but, perhaps, when alone and by night (Bu.); cp. 4^{18}.—*Concerning me*] not *to me* (Bu.), for the friends had spoken *to* not God, but Job. God confirms (cp. 16^{21}) the truth in general of Job's account of His ways and condemns as false that of the friends.—*What is right*] *i.e.* true, certain (נכונה, cp. Ps. 5^{10}, Dt. 13^{15}, 1 S. 23^{23}).

8. The sin of the friends having been great must be expiated by an exceptionally large burnt-offering, and even so the offering must be reinforced by the prayer of one who has proved himself an exceptionally steadfast servant of Yahweh.—*Him will I accept*] lit. *his face will I lift up*: cp. 13^{8} n.—*Seven bullocks and seven rams*] in Nu. 23 f. Balaam offers on seven different altars seven bullocks and seven rams in all; Ezekiel required as burnt-offerings for the entire people (Ezk. 45^{22-25}) seven bullocks and seven rams daily during the two great annual festivals; but the expiatory sacrifices required by the law from individuals were much smaller (Lv. 4).—*A burnt-offering*] see n. on 1^{5}.—*And let Job pray for thee*, etc.] cp. Gn. 20^{7}, Nu. 21^{7}, 1 S $7^{5f.}$—*That I deal not mercilessly with you*] "(lit. do no *nebālāh* to you, do nothing regardless of your feelings or claims: see on 2^{10}), *i.e.* lest I punish you without compunction or regret . . . of course, the expression implies an anthropomorphism" (Dr.).

10. *Changed Job's fortunes*] lit., according to the view taken of the etymology of the noun *brought back the captives of Job* (see especially Preuschen in *ZATW*, 1895, 1 ff.) or *turned the*

two-fold. [11] And all his brethren and all his sisters and all who formerly knew him came and ate bread with him in his house; and they showed their grief for him, and comforted him for all the evil which Yahweh had brought upon him; and they gave him each a ḳesiṭah and each a ring of gold. [12] And Yahweh blest the last part of Job's life more than the first part: and so he came to have fourteen thousand sheep and goats, and six thousand camels, and a thousand yoke of oxen, and a thousand she-asses. [13] And he had seven sons and three daughters:

---

turning of Job (Ew. al.); see phil. n.—***When he prayed on behalf of his friends***] probably Hi. was right in surmising that the clause originally stood at the end of ^{9} (cp. ^{8}). In its present position it has been variously understood as defining the time (Di.), or the ground, of the change in Job's fortunes; in the latter case render ***because he prayed***, etc., and cp. Is. 53^{12}. 𝔊 And when he prayed for the friends, he forgave them their sin: but between the first and third clauses of the v. this is not likely to be the true reading.—**b.** Explicated in detail in ^{12}. —*Increased*] strictly, as Du. points out, ***gave back*** is required: RV. eases the sentence by inserting "before" after ***had***.

11. Job's kinsmen and acquaintance, who had kept away during his illness and poverty ($19^{13ff.}$), now that he is restored
(10) to health and wealth, visit him, and express their sorrow for the troubles now past, accept his hospitality, and give him presents such as were customarily given by visitors.—***Showed their grief***] 2^{11} n.—*A ḳesiṭah*] a piece of money mentioned elsewhere only in JE (Gn. 33^{19}, Jos. 24^{32}), and introduced here, perhaps, as a mark of the patriarchal age. The *ḳesiṭah* was presumably of no great value, since Abraham gave a hundred *ḳesiṭahs* for a piece of ground; speculations on the curious rendering ***lamb*** by 𝔊 and on the etymology may be found in *EBi.*, *s.v.* **Ḳesitah** and Levy, *NHWB* iv. 396.—*A ring*] such as was worn (by women) on the nose (Gn. 24^{47}, Is. 3^{21}), or (by men) especially among the Bedawin (Jg. 8^{24}), in the ear (Gn. 35^{4}).

12a. Cp. 8^{7}.—**b.** Cp. 1^{3}; the numbers of the cattle are exactly double (cp. ^{10}) of those there given of Job's earlier

[14] and he named the first (daughter) Jemimah, the second Ḳeṣi'ah, and the third Ḳeren-happuch; [15] and women as fair as the daughters of Job were not to be found in all the earth: and their father gave them an inheritance among their brothers. [16] And Job lived after this a hundred and forty years, and saw his sons, and his sons' sons, (even) four generations. [17] And Job died old and full of days.

---

possessions; the servants of which no exact number is given in 1^3 are here not mentioned: and the children (^{13}) are the same in number, not twice as many, as formerly (1^2).

14. The names appear to have been chosen to correspond to the beauty or charms of the bearers of them; *Jemimah* probably means dove (cp. Ca. 2^{14} 5^2 6^9) or little dove; *Ḳeṣi'ah*, a powdered fragrant bark, prized for its scent (Ps. 45^8), and *Ḳeren-happuch*, horn, *i.e.* flask (1 S. 16^1, 1 K. 1^{39}), of antimony, a black mineral powder used (2 K. 9^{30}, Jer. 4^{30}), and still used, by women in the East, to darken the edges of the eyelids and so increase by contrast the lustre of the eye.

15b. According to Nu. 27^8 (P) the daughters of a Jewish father only inherited when there were no sons; the statement may be a remnant of a fuller story about Job's daughters (Du.), and the reason for it is best left undetermined: Hi. Bu. al. see in it proof of Job's wealth and fatherly regard, Di. a provision for allowing the daughters after marriage to continue to live among their brothers—a parallel trait to 1^4.

16. According to 𝔊, Job lived after his restoration to prosperity 170 years, and in all 240, *i.e.* he was 70 years old at the time of his trial; this last point may belong to the tradition on which the Epilogue draws: then assuming the *one hundred and forty* of 𝔐 to be correct, he not only enjoyed double prosperity (^{10}), but enjoyed it for double as long.

16. *And Job lived after*] Gn. 5^7 (P). — **b.** Cp. Gn. 50^{23}, Ps. 128^6.

17. Cp. Gn. 25^8 35^{29} (P). On the longer conclusion in 𝔊 which records that Job will share in the future resurrection from the dead, see Introd. § 45. 48, and *Exp.* 1920 (June), 428 ff.

A CRITICAL AND EXEGETICAL COMMENTARY

ON

THE BOOK OF JOB

BY

SAMUEL ROLLES DRIVER, D.D.

AND

GEORGE BUCHANAN GRAY, D.Litt.

VOLUME II

THE INTERNATIONAL CRITICAL COMMENTARY

A CRITICAL AND EXEGETICAL COMMENTARY

ON

THE BOOK OF JOB

TOGETHER WITH A NEW TRANSLATION

BY THE LATE

SAMUEL ROLLES DRIVER, D.D.

REGIUS PROFESSOR OF HEBREW AND CANON OF CHRIST CHURCH, OXFORD
HON. D.LITT., CAMBRIDGE AND DUBLIN; HON. D.D., GLASGOW AND ABERDEEN
FELLOW OF THE BRITISH ACADEMY

AND

GEORGE BUCHANAN GRAY, D.Litt.

PROFESSOR OF HEBREW AND OLD TESTAMENT EXEGESIS IN MANSFIELD COLLEGE
AND GRINFIELD LECTURER ON THE SEPTUAGINT, OXFORD
HON. D.D., ABERDEEN

(IN TWO VOLUMES)

VOLUME II

NEW YORK
CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS
1921

CONTENTS

ADDENDA ET CORRIGENDA.

PHILOLOGICAL NOTES.

P. 18, l. 13. *After* "(*ZAW*, 1897, p. 183 ff.)" *add*: and still more recently by J. Hehn in *Orient. Studien Fritz Hommel . . . gewid.* ii. 79–90.

P. 160, l. 28. Perles (*Orient. Stud.* ii. 133) derives תכונה from תכן, and proposes the meaning "unergründliches Wesen"—a synonym of הקר in 11^7.

P. 273, ll. 14, 15. *For* "$^{6-11}$ in editions of 𝔊 . . . continuous lines in 𝔊" *read*: "in editions of 𝔊, $^{6-11}$ except, ^{10a}, are Θ, and ^{11a} 𝔊 (*ἀλλὰ τοῦ δικαίου εἰσακούσεται*) is not obviously a rendering of ^{10a} 𝔐 (ויגל אזנם למוסר). Thus, in an earlier text of 𝔊, the following appear to have been consecutive lines: ^{5} 𝔊 = ^{5} 𝔐, ^{10a} 𝔊 = ? 𝔐, ^{12a} 𝔊 = ^{6a} 𝔐."

PRINCIPAL ABBREVIATIONS EMPLOYED

1. TEXTS AND VERSIONS.

'A, Aq. . . .	Aquila.
AVm. . . .	Authorised Version (margin).
EV(V). . . .	English Version(s).
MS(S) Ken., de Rossi	Hebrew Manuscripts as cited in Kennicott or De Rossi.
Oc., Or(ient) . .	Occidental (Palestinian) and Oriental (Babylonian), see G-K. *7h* n.; and for the readings of the two schools in Job, S. Baer, *Liber Jobi* (1875), pp. 56–58.
OT. . . .	Old Testament.
PBV. . . .	Prayer Book Version.
RVm. . . .	Revised Version (margin).
Σ, Symm. . .	Symmachus.
Θ, Theod. . .	Theodotion.
𝔊	The ancient Greek (LXX) Version of the OT. (ed. Swete, Cambridge, 1887–1894). The readings of the codices are, when necessary, distinguished thus:—𝔊^A 𝔊^B (Alexandrian, Vatican, etc.). For the cursives, reference has been made to *Vet. Test. Græce, cum variis lectionibus*, ed. R. Holmes et J. Parsons (Oxon. 1823), which is cited as HP followed by a numeral denoting the cursive. Editions of Job contain much that is really Θ (see Introd. §§ 48–51): such matter is commonly cited as 𝔊 (Θ).
𝔐	The Hebrew (unvocalized) text, *i.e.* the consonants of the ordinary Hebrew MSS and printed Bibles.
𝔐¹. . . .	The consonants of the traditional Hebrew text (𝔐) irrespective of the present word divisions and after the removal of the vowel consonants (cp. *Isaiah*, p. xxv).
𝔈	The Coptic (Sahidic) Version of 𝔊 (§ 48).
𝔏	Old Latin Version of 𝔊.

𝔐 . . . . The Massoretic Text (*i.e.* the vocalized text of the Hebrew Bible). Variants in the Hebrew codices have been cited from De Rossi, *Variæ Lectiones Vet. Test.*; Kennicott, *Vet. Test. Heb. cum variis lectionibus*; or R. Kittel, *Biblia Hebraica*.

𝔒 . . . . Targum Onkelos.

𝔖 . . . . The Syriac Version (Peshiṭta).

$𝔖^H$ . . . . The Syro-Hexaplar Version of 𝔊.

𝔗 . . . . Targum: $𝔗^1$ $𝔗^2$, etc., first, second renderings in 𝔗.

𝔙 . . . . Vulgate.

2. AUTHORS' NAMES AND BOOKS.

[See also the literature cited, especially in the Introduction, §§ 23 n., 28, 41, 45, 48, 50 n., 51 n.]

Anon. . . . Anonymous Hebrew Commentary, ed. W. A. Wright, with Eng. tr. by S. A. Hirsch (1905)—later than Ibn Ezra and Qi.

AJSL . . . *American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literature*.

Baer . . . S. Baer, *Liber Jobi*, 1875.

BDB . . . See *Lex.*

Be[er, G.] Be^T. (1) *Der Text des Buches Hiob* (1897)—Be^T.

Be^{Kit}. (2) Notes in R. Kittel, *Bibl. Hebr.*—Be^{Kit}.

Bi[ckell, G.] . . (1) *Carmina VT metrice*, 1882, pp. 151–187.

(2) *Krit. Bearbeitung des Job-Dialogs*, *WZKM*, 1892, pp. 137 ff., 241 ff., 327 ff.; 1893, pp. 1 ff., 153 ff. Cp. (3). *Das Buch Hiob nach Anleitung der Strophik u. d. Septuaginta auf seine ursprüngliche Form zurück-geführt u. im Versmasse des Urtextes übersetzt*, 1894.

Boch[art] . . *Opera Omnia*, Lugd. 1712.

Bolducius . . *Comm. in Jobum*, 1631.

Bu[dde], K. . . (1) *Beiträge zur Kritik des B. Hiob*, 1876.

(2) *Das Buch Hiob* (in Nowack's, *Handkommentar*), ¹1896, ²1913.

Buhl . . . See G–B.

Carey, C. P. . . *The Book of Job translated*, etc., 1858.

Ch[e[yne, T. K.] . (1) *Job and Solomon*, 1887.

(2) *Job* and other contributions to *EBi.*

ChWB . . . See Levy.

CIS . . . *Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum*, Paris, 1881 ff.

Cooke, G. A. . *N*[*orth*] *S*[*emitic*] *I*[*nscriptions*], Oxford, 1903.

Cox, S. . . . *A Commentary on the Book of Job*, 1880.

CP. . . . See Rogers.

Da[v[idson], A. B (1) *A Commentary on the Book of Job* [i–xiv], 1862.

(2) *The Book of Job* in *The Camb. Bible for Schools*, 1884.

DB . . .	Dictionary of the Bible, and in particular *A Dictionary of the Bible*, ed. James Hastings, 1898–1904.
Del[itzsch, Franz].	*Das Buch Hiob* in *Biblischer Comm. ü. d. AT*, ^{1}1864 (Eng. tr.), ^{2}1876.
Del[itzsch, Fried.].	(1) *Assyrisches Handwörterbuch*, 1896, cited as *HWB*.
	(2) *Das Buch Hiob neu übersetzt u. kurzerklärt*, Leipzig, 1902.
Di[llmann, A.] .	*Hiob* (in *K*[*urzgefasstes*] *E*[*xegetisches*] *H*[*andbuch*]), ^{4}1891.
Dr[iver, S. R.] .	(1) *A Treatise on the Use of the Tenses in Hebrew*, ^{3}1892.
	(2) *An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament* (abbreviated *LOT*), ^{9}1913.
	(3) *The Book of Job in the Revised Version*, 1906.
	(4) *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel*, ^{2}1913.
Du[hm, B.] . .	*Das Buch Hiob erklärt* in Marti's *Kurzer Handcommentar zum AT*, 1897.
EBi. . . .	*Encyclopædia Biblica*, edited by T. K. Cheyne and J. S. Black, 1899–1903.
Ehrlich, A. B. .	*Randglossen zur Hebr. Bibel* (1913), vi. 180–344.
ET . . .	*Expository Times*.
Ew. . . .	(1) *Lehrbuch d. Hebr. Sprache*.
	(2) *Die Dichter des Alten Bundes*, dritter Theil, ^{2}1854.
Exp. . . .	*The Expositor*.
Forms . . .	See Gray, 3.
Freyt[ag, G. W.] .	*Lexicon Arabico-Latinum*, 1830.
G-B. . . .	*Wilhelm Gesenius' hebräisches u. aram. Handwörterbuch über das AT . . . bearbeitet von Frantz Buhl*, ^{16}1915.
Ges[enius, W.] .	*Thes*[*aurus*].
GGA . . .	*Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen*.
Gi[nsburg, C. D.].	עשרים וארבעה ספרי הקדש תנ, i.e. *The Old Testament in Hebrew according to MSS and old editions*, 1894.
G-K. . . .	*Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar* . . . English edition by A. Cowley, ^{2}1910 (=28th German edition, 1909).
Gr[ätz, H.] . .	*Emendationes in plerosque . . . VT libros*, 1892.
Gray, G. B. . .	(1) *Studies in Hebrew Proper Names*, 1896 (abbreviated *HPN*).
	(2) [*A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on*] *Isaiah* [i–xxvii].
	(3) [*The*] *Forms* [*of Hebrew Poetry*], 1915.
Ha[hn, H. A.] .	*Commentar über d. B. Hiob*, 1850.
Hfm, or Hoffm. .	*Hiob nach J. C. E. Hoffmann*, 1891.
Hi[tz[ig, F.] . .	*Das Buch Hiob übersetzt u. ausgelegt*, 1874.
Hirzel (or Hrz), L.	*KEH*^{1} (1839), see Di.
Honth[eim, J.] .	*Das Buch Hiob als strophisches Kunstwerk nachgewiesen übersetzt u. erklärt*, 1904.

Houb[igant, C. F.]	*Notæ criticæ in universos VT libros*, ii. 155–218 (1777).
HPN . . .	See Gray, 1.
I[bn] E[zra], Abraham († 1167)	Hebrew Comm. on Job in Buxtorf's *Biblia Rabbinica.*
ICC . . .	*International Critical Commentary.*
Isaiah . . .	See Gray, 2.
JBLit. . . .	*Journal of Biblical Literature.*
Jer[ome] († 420) .	
JDT . . .	*Jahrbücher f. deutsche Theologie.*
JPh . . .	*Journal of Philology.*
JQR . . .	*Jewish Quarterly Review.*
JThS . . .	*Journal of Theological Studies.*
*KAT*³ . . .	*Die Keilinschriften u. d. AT*, von Eberhard Schrader, dritte Auflage neu bearbeitet von H. Zimmern u. H. Winckler, 1903.
Kamph[ausen] .	In Bunsen's *Bibelwerk*, Abth. i. Bd. 3, 1865.
KB . . .	*Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek*, von E. Schrader, 1889–1901.
Ḳi	See Qi.
Klo[stermann, A.].	*Hiob* in *PRE* viii. 97–126.
Kön[ig, E.] . .	*Historisch-Kritisches Lehrgebaüde der Hebräischen Sprache*, 1881, 1895: the concluding volume (cited as Kön. iii. or simply Kön.) appeared in 1897 with a fresh title, *Historisch-comparative Syntax d. Hebr. Sprache.*
Königsb[erger, B.]	*Hiob Studien*, 1896.
Kue[nen, A.]. .	*Historisch-Kritisch Onderzoek naar het Ontstaan . . . van de Boeken des Ouden Verbondes*, ²1865.
Lane, E. W. . .	*An Arabic-English Lexicon*, 1863.
Lex . . .	Lexicon, and unless otherwise defined *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament based on the Thesaurus of Gesenius*, by F. Brown, C. A. Briggs, and S. R. Driver, Oxford, 1906.
Levy, J. . .	(1) *ChWB*, i.e., *Chaldäisches Wörterbuch über die Targumim*, Leipzig, 1881. (2) *NHWB*, i.e., *Neuhebräisches u. Chaldäisches Wörterbuch über die Talmudim u. Midraschim*, 1876–1889.
Lidz[barski, M.] .	(1) *Handbuch d. Nordsem. Epigraphik*, 1898—*NSE.* (2) *Eph[emeris f. sem. Epigraphik]*, 1900 ff.
LOT . . .	See Dr. 2.
Matthes, J. C. .	*Het Boek Job vertaald en verklaard*, 1865.
Me[rx, A.] . .	*Das Gedicht von Hiob*, 1871.
Meyer, E. . .	*[Die] I[sraeliten u. ihre] N[achbar] S[tämme]*, 1906.
Mich[aelis, J. H.].	*Annotationes in Hagiogr.*
NH(W)B . .	See Levy, 2.
Nöl[d[eke, T.] .	*Beitr[äge zur sem. Sprachwissenschaft]*, 1904.
Nichols, Helen H..	*The Composition of the Elihu Speeches* (in *AJSL*, vol. xxvii., 1911, and printed separately).

NSE . . . See Lidz.
NSI . . . See Cooke.
Ol[sh[ausen, J.] . *KEH*[2] (1852): see Di.
Oo[rt, H.] . . *Textus Hebraici emendationes quibus in VT Neerlandice vertendo usi sunt A. Kuenen al.*
P[ayne] S[mith, R.] *Thesaurus Syriacus*, 1900.
Pe[a[ke, A. S.] . *The Century Bible: Job*, 1905.
PEFQuSt . . *Palestine Exploration Fund Quarterly Statement.*
Perles, F. . . *Analekten zur Textkritik des AT*, 1895.
PL. . . . Migne, *Paleologia Latina.*
PRE . . . Herzog's *Real-Encyklopädie f. Protestantische Theologie*, 3rd ed. by A. Hauck.
Qi. . . . David Qimḥi († 1230).
Ralbag . . . R[abbi] L[evi] b[en] G[ershon] († 1344): Heb. Comm. in Buxtorf's *Biblia Rabbinica.*
Ra[shi] . . . R[abboni] Sh[elomoh] Y[isḥaḳi] (1040–1105). Hebrew Commentary on Job in Buxtorf's *Bibl. Rabbinica.*
RB . . . *Revue Biblique Internationale publiée par l'École pratique d'Études Bibliques établie au convent Dominicain Saint-Étienne de Jerusalem* (Paris).
R[ei]sk[e, J. J.] . *Conjecturæ in Jobum et Proverbia*, Lips. 1779.
REJ . . . *Revue des Études Juives.*
Renan, E. . . *Le livre de Job*, 1860.
Richter, G. . . *Dunkle Stellen im Buche Hiob*, 1912.
Rogers, R. W. . *C[uneiform] P[arallels to the Old Testament].*
Ros[enmüller] . *Jobus*, Lips. 1806.
Saad. . . . Saadiah († 942).
Sam[uel][B] . . See Dr. 4.
Schl[ottmann] . *D. B. Hiob*, 1851.
Schnurrer . . *Animadversiones ad quædam loca Jobi*, Tüb. 1781–2.
Schult[ens, A.] . *Liber Jobi*, Lugd. 1737.
S[ie]gf[ried, C.] . *The Book of Job, critical edition of the Hebrew Text*, 1893.
Sievers, E. . . *Metrische Studien* in the *Abhandlungen der phil.-hist. classe d. könig. sächsischen Gesellschaft d. Wissenschaften*, xxi. (1901). The *Textproben* include Job 3–7.
Sta[de, B.] . . (1) *Lehrbuch d. hebr. Sprache*, 1879.
(2) *WB*=Siegfried, C. u. Stade, B., *Hebr. Wörterbuch zum AT.*
St[ick]el . . . *Das Buch Hiob*, 1842.
Strahan, J. . . *The Book of Job interpreted*, 1913.
Stu[der, G. L.] . *Das Buch Hiob*, 1881.
Stuhl[mann, M. H.] *Hiob*, 1804.
Thomson, W. M. . *The L[and and the] B[ook]*, 1867.
Tristram, H. B. . [*The*] *N*[*atural*] *H*[*istory of the*] *B*[*ible*], 1867.
TSK . . . *Theologische Studien u. Kritiken.*
Voi[gt, Cl.] . . *Einige Stellen d. B. Hiob*, Lauban, 1895.

We[llh.] . . .	Wellhausen, J.
Wetz[stein] . .	Notes in Del.
Wr[ight, G. H. B.]	*The Book of Job*, 1883.
WZKM . .	*Wiener Zeitschrift f. d. Kunde des Morgenlandes.*
ZA . . .	*Zeitschrift f. d. Assyriologie.*
ZA(T)W . .	*Zeitschrift f. d. Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft.*
ZDMG . .	*Zeitschr. d. deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft.*
ZDPV . . .	*Zeitschrift d. deutschen Pälastina-Vereins.*

Biblical passages are cited according to the Hebrew enumeration of chapters and verses: where this differs from the English enumeration, the reference to the latter has commonly (except in the philological notes) been added in a parenthesis. In the translation of c. 41, however, it seemed more convenient to place the English enumeration first.

The sign †, following a series of references, indicates that all examples of the phrase, word, form or meaning in question, occurring in the OT, have been cited.

The signs ⌜ ⌝ enclosing words in the translation (*e.g.* 3^{14}) indicate departures from 𝔐 (occasionally also departures even from 𝔊 have been so indicated). Small print in the translation indicates probable additions, and unleaded type the longer interpolations of cc. 28. 32–37.

al. = alii (others).

Cp. = Compare.

Ct. = Contrast.

PART II.

PHILOLOGICAL NOTES.

CHAPTER I.

1. איש היה] The story begins with the subject prefixed and without the copula, precisely as Nathan's story in 2 S. 12^1 שני אנשים היו. Ct. . . . ויהי at the commencement of the books of Jos., Jg., Sam., and also of Ezk., Ru., Est. See Kön. iii. 365*g*, and Paton's note on Est. 1^1.

איש] $𝔊^B$ *ἄνθρωπός τις*, 𝔖 ܓܒܪܐ ܚܕ. It is unnecessary to infer that 𝔐 originally read איש אחד; this would, indeed, be thoroughly idiomatic (see Dr. on 1 S. 1^1); but such an expression of indetermination is relatively rare (G–K. 125*b*).

והיה] not merely equal to, nor a colloquialism (Du.) for, ויהי; nor should we infer from 𝔖 ܓܒܪ ܗܘܐ that 𝔐 originally read היה איש תם; but והיה is *frequentative* (cf. Dr. § 120): Job's character is indicated by reference to qualities repeatedly manifested.

תם וישר] so 1^8 2^3 𝔐. $𝔊^A$ in all three passages *ἄμεμπτος, δίκαιος, ἀληθεινός*; ^{B} in 1^1 *ἀληθινός, ἄμεμπτος, δίκαιος*, in 1^8 *ἄμεμπτος, ἀληθινός*, in 2^3 *ἄκακος, ἀληθινός, ἄμεμπτος*. The original text of 𝔊 was probably in all three places *ἄμεμπτος, ἄληθινος*; *δίκαιος* will then be a doublet of *ἀληθινός*, *ἄκακος* of *ἄμεμπτος*. Beer, indeed, suggests that 𝔊 originally rendered the single Hebrew word תם by two Greek words, *ἀληθινός, ἄμεμπτος*, and compares רננה = *εὐφροσύνη . . . χαρμονή*, 3^{7b}, and נפלאות = *ἔνδοξά τε καὶ ἐξαίσια*, 5^{9b}; but this fails to explain the *variations* of 𝔊, and is not favoured by equivalences elsewhere in the book; *ἀληθινὸς* renders ישר in 4^7 8^6 6^{25} 17^8, but never תם, and outside Job *ἀλ.* = תם only in Dt. 32^4; *ἄμεμπτος* = תם or תמים in 9^{20} 12^4, but never = ישר.

Ἄκακος occurs only thrice in Job—in 8^{20} = תם, 36^{5} a repetition in 𝔊 of 8^{20} (𝔐 *aliter*), and in $2^{3\,B}$; *δίκαιος* nowhere renders either תמ(ים) or ישר in Job, though elsewhere it very occasionally renders both these words.

וירא] read ירא as in 1^{8} 2^{3}: so here also 2 MSS [Ken.] and 𝔗; 𝔊 cannot be cited. Each member of the two pairs was copulated, the pairs themselves uncopulated.

2. ויולדו] *and so* (Dr. § 74) *there were born*: the waw consecutive is fittingly used: piety is followed by the gift of God (Ps. 127^{3})—many children, and most of them sons.

3. ויהי] again the waw consecutive: at a later stage in life (cf. ויהי לו in Gn. 26^{14} after v.[13]) his cattle *came to be*, or amounted to, 7000, etc.

עבדה] Gn. 26^{14} †. עבדה is a collective—an alternative expression (Gn. 26^{14}) for עבדים (Gn. 12^{16}). Cf. פקדה (‖ to the *pl.* נגשיך) in Is. 60^{17} (RV. "officers"), and perhaps גבורה (‖ to *pl.* מתיך) in Is. 3^{25}. Cf. F. E. C. Dietrich, *Abh. z. hebr. Gram.* 84; C. Brockelmann, *Grundriss d. Gram. d. sem. Sprachen*, i. 228*c*.

עבדה רבה מאד] is doubly rendered in 𝔊: (1) *καὶ ὑπηρεσία πολλὴ σφόδρα*; (2) *καὶ ἔργα μεγάλα ἦν αὐτῷ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς*. Beer suggests that (1) is 𝔊, (2) Theodotion, and that *ἐπὶ τ. γ.* arises from בה מאד read באדמה.

גדול מכל] *greater than any*: see BDB. 482*a*.

4. והלכו . . . ועשו . . . ושלחו . . . וקראו] frequentatives. In v.[5a] the simple narrative imperfect consecutives are used, the frequentatives reappearing in v.[5b] (. . . והשכים והעלה . . . יעשה): see Dr. § 114 *β*, 120.

והלכו . . . ועשו משתה בית איש יומו] this is sometimes cited as an example of the use of הלך as a mere introductory word (cf. BDB. 233*b* bottom, and 234*a* middle; Ges.-B. 180*a* top); so Du., *e.g.*, renders והלכו, *sie sind zu Werk gegangen*, and Bu. gives no definite translation of it. Dr. on Dt. 31^{1} disputes such an explanation of הלך either here or in several other alleged instances. The question, so far as this passage is concerned, turns on three other considerations: (1) the meaning of עשה משתה; (2) the originality of בית; and, if בית belonged to the original text, (3) the meaning

and construction of בית איש יומו. As to (1): in this passage, but in this passage alone, it is customary to render עשה משתה, *to hold a feast* (so, *e.g.*, RV.); but this is really illegitimate; the phrase occurs frequently, meaning not *to hold*, or *participate in*, but always *to give*, or *furnish*, a banquet (RV. *make a feast*); see Gn. 19[3] 21[8] 26[30] 29[22] 40[20], Jg. 14[10], 2 S. 3[20], 1 K. 3[15], Est. 1[3. 5. 9] 2[18] 5[4. 5. 8. 12] 6[14], Is. 25[6]. *To keep a feast*, had this been intended here, would have been differently expressed; note especially היה לחם המשתה, Jg. 14[17] (ct. v.[10]), and see also 1 S. 25[36], Est. 8[17]. The phrase עשה חג (RV. *to keep the feast*; see, *e.g.*, Ex. 34[22], Dt. 16[10]), to which Hitz. appealed for rendering *held a feast* here, is really quite different; the חג *included* (sacrificial) meals, but also much more; and in so far as the phrase עשה חג refers to the meal, it refers at least as much to the provision of it as to the participation in it. (2) If בית be omitted the construction is simple: *his sons used to give a banquet, each on his day*; but in this case no real force can be allowed to והלכו, for the one who gave the feast presumably remained in his own house. Sieg. and, doubtfully, Beer omit בית: and the latter appeals to 𝔊; but בית is possibly, not to say certainly, expressed in συμπορευόμεναι πρὸς ἀλλήλους (Bu.). In any case בית should be retained. (3) On possible explanations of בית איש יומו, cf. G–K. 139*c*: it might mean *in the house* (acc. of place, G–K. 118*g*) *of*, *i.e.*, appointed for, *the day of each* (so Dr. in an apparently early MS). But this is awkward, and also incompatible with giving to הלכו its full sense of *went*. It looks as though by a breviloquence two sentences have been telescoped into one, והלכו בניו בית איש יומו ועשו משתה איש יומו: *his sons used to go to the house of each on his day, and they used, each on his day, to give a banquet*. This view is substantially that represented by 𝔊. For יומו, acc. of time, see G–K. 118*i*.

שלשת] MS [Ken.] 157 reads שלש; at best this would scarcely be more than an accidental coincidence with the original text: but it is doubtful whether the original must have read שלש (yet see v.[2]); for the fem. form of the numeral before fem. nouns, see Gn. 7[13] and G–K. 97*c*.

5. הקיפו] cf. ינקפו, pointed as Kal, in Is. 29[1]. It is

commonly held that ימי המשתה is the subj.; but in view of the Kal in Is. 29[1] it is perhaps more probable that the subj. is the same as that of the preceding vbs., and ימי המשתה is the obj.

וישלח . . . ויקדשם] ct. v.[4] ושלחו . . . וקראו ל. 𝔗 indeed, has both for קדש in v.[5] and קרא in v.[4] the same vb.—זמן; but elsewhere this vb. renders both קרא (*e.g.* 1 S. 9[24]) and קדש (*e.g.* Jl. 2[16], Mic. 3[5]), and 𝔗 is, therefore, no evidence for a reading ויקראם in v.[5].

עלות] 8 MSS [Ken.] read עלת, two others עולת: עלת was doubtless the reading of 𝔐[1] whence, incorrectly, 𝔊 *θυσίαν* with variants, representing corrections, *θυσίας*. That the pl. was intended is shown by the following clause.

מספר] acc. of limitation or definition: cf. 1 S. 6[4. 18], Ex. 16[16], 2 S. 21[20], and Ew. §§ *204b*, *300c*; G–K. 118*h*: so Dr. on 1 S. 6[4].

כלם] 𝔊 + *καὶ μόσχον ἕνα περὶ ἁμαρτίας περὶ τῶν ψυχῶν αὐτῶν*: the clause *may* rest on a Hebrew original (פר אחד לחטאת על נפשותיהם: cf. *e.g.* Lv. 16[3], Nu. 15[28]); but even if so, the words are secondary and due to the interpolator failing to realize that to the author of the book, as to the Hebrews of an early period, the עולה had by itself sufficient expiating virtue.

וברכו] lit. *and blessed*; but this meaning is impossible in the context, as also in v.[11] 2[5. 9], 1 K. 21[10. 13]; in Ps. 10[3], which is sometimes coupled with these passages, the text is corrupt (see Gray, *Forms of Hebrew Poetry*, p. 274 f.). Hence some modern scholars by a series of hypotheses have assigned to ברך in these passages the meaning *to renounce*: from the fact that people blessed at meeting (Gn. 47[7], 2 K. 4[29]) and parting (Gn. 24[60], 1 K. 8[66]), it has been inferred that ברך obtained the meaning *to bless at parting*, that then losing the reference to blessing, it came to mean *to bid farewell to*, and then, by a sinister development, *to renounce*; for not one of these hypothetical meanings is there the slightest evidence; and though *renounce* might suit the contexts in Job, it is much too weak a sense for 1 K. 21[10. 13]. That explanation must, therefore, be abandoned. Either ברך was actually used euphemistically with the meaning *to curse* or *blaspheme*, or a word such as קלל

or נדף stood in the original text, and ברך was subsequently substituted for it in the five passages in question. As between these alternatives the decision is not easy; Beer, indeed, who cites the evidence very fully (pp. 2–5), argues that there are traces of a text in which ברך had not yet ejected a word of opposite meaning. But the argument is less conclusive than he and Bu. think. For there are no Hebrew variants, and in Versions *curse* or the like might be either an *interpretation* of ברך or a *translation* of קלל: for example, in all six places 𝔖 uses ܠܛ, *to curse*; but this may simply be a correct interpretation of ברך which stood then as it stands now in the text, and need not imply that 𝔖, both in Kings and in Job, rests on a text which still had קלל and not yet ברך. Similarly we cannot safely infer that 𝔗 had a mixed text: ברך in Job 2^{9}, where it renders by בריך; but קלל or the like in Job $1^{5.\,11}$ 2^{5}, where it renders by ארגיז, *to provoke to anger*, and in 1 K. $21^{10.\,13}$, where it renders by נדף, *to revile*. The evidence both for the original text and for the significance of 𝔊 is more conflicting. In 1 K. $21^{10.\,13}$ the rendering is *εὐλογεῖν*, with the addition as a scholion on v.^{10} in MS 55 (H. and P.), *ἤτοι κεκακολόγηκας* (see Field). In the five places in Job the renderings vary: in 1^{11} 2^{5} *εὐλογεῖν* is used, but Chrys. (H. and P.) cites 1^{11} with the substitution of *βλασφημήσει* for *εὐλογήσει*, and Ambros. adds to *benedicat* the note, "non enim ausus est dicere, maledicat, sed hoc intelligendum reliquit." In 2^{5} Field cites from Cod. Reg., *ὁ Ἑβραῖος . . . βλασφημήσει*, and from 161 the scholion *τὸ εὐλογήσει ἀντὶ τοῦ ὑβρίσει· ὁ γοῦν Ἑβραῖος σαφῶς βλασφημήσει ἔχει*. Either these few testimonies show that the original reading of 𝔊 was *βλασφημήσει*, and of the Hebrew יקלל or the like, and that the *εὐλογήσει* of the vast majority of the witnesses to 𝔊 is derived from Aq., or the original reading was *εὐλογήσει*, for which here and there the *interpretation* *βλασφημήσει* was substituted in the text instead of being simply attached to the text as in the note cited above. In 1^{5} and 2^{9} the rendering whatever the Hebrew text was, is not literal: in 1^{5} for חטאו . . . וברכו בלבבם, 𝔊 has *ἐν τῇ διανοίᾳ αὐτῶν κακὰ ἐνενόησαν πρός*; in 2^{9} for ברך it has *εἰπόν τι ῥῆμα εἰς*; in

Cod. Colb. (Field) stands the note *διπλῆ γραφή· εὐλόγησον θεόν*; in Cod. 161, 248 (H. and P.) on the marg. *ἄλλος· κατάρασαι τὸν θεόν*. Beer argues that in 1^5 𝔊 renders the two verbs by one phrase because the translator wished to soften a text which contained קלל instead of ברך. But if the original text of 𝔊 contained *βλασφημήσει* in 1^{11} 2^5, there would be no reason for avoiding it in 1^5; and if *εὐλογήσει* (= ברך) was the original text in 1^{11} 2^5, there is little ground for suspecting that anything but ברכו stood in 𝔊's Hebrew original in 1^5, for in a compound expression that was to serve as an equivalent for both חטאו and ברכו the translator might well have allowed himself to be dominated by חטאו. The possibility remains that ברך was a substitute for קלל or the like at a stage in the history of the text prior to the earliest versions. Evidence of similar changes is clear: note, *e.g.*, the insertion of איבי in 1 S. 25^{22}, 2 S. 12^{14} (with Driver's notes), and see Geiger, *Urschrift*, p. 267 ff.

כל הימים] *all the days* in question; *i.e.* whenever (note the frequentative יעשה) a cycle of feast-days came to an end. Commonly כל הימים means *all the time*; so with the *past* (*e.g.* 1 K. 5^{15}); or with reference to the future, being then practically = עד עולם (cf. *e.g.* 1 K. 9^3).

6. ויהי היום] so v.^{13} 2^1, 1 S. 1^4 14^1, 2 K. $4^{8.\ 11.\ 18}$; see Dr. on 1 S. 1^4.

התיצב על] so 2^1: cf. Zec. 6^5; for the force of על, see BDB, p. 756*a*.

7. משוט] 2^2 משט.

8. על] cf. Hag. $1^{6.7}$; some MSS read אל; the latter is read in 2^3; 𝔊 here *κατά*, in 2^3 the dat. With אל, cf. 34^{14} (?), 1 S. 25^{25}.

10. שַׂכְתָּ] The verb is used with different meanings in Hos. 2^8 and (with ס for שׂ) in Job 3^{23} 38^8. The root שוך or סוך is presupposed, if we may rely on the *scriptio plena*, by the noun form מסוכה, Mic. 7^4, and by the vocalization also in מְשֻׂכָה, Pr. 15^{19}, here, and in Hos. 2^8 (שָׂךְ, part.). The form וַיָּסֶךְ, 3^{23} 38^8, might come either from סוך or סכך, while in Is. 5^5 (מְשׂוּכָּתוֹ) the consonants and vocalization are at conflict. A few MSS here read סַכֹּתָ, which would, of course, be from סכך.

ܡܛܠ ܟܠܗܘܢ + S [ובעד ביתו

מעשה] sing. as Hag. 2[14], La. 3[64]; the VV. render by a pl.; but this does not prove that there was a Hebrew reading מעשי (Beer), any more than 𝔊's *τὰ κτήνη* below proves that there was a reading מקניהו.

11. ואולם] in 2[5] אולם (after נפשו): so here MS [Ken.] 17; 𝔊 *ἀλλά* (= ואולם, 11[5] 12[7]).

נא] [Ken.] 102 om.; cf. 𝔊S.

אם לא] either elliptical (*see*) *if he will not curse thee*, or with strong asseveration (G–K. 149*e*), *Surely he will curse thee*.

על פניך] *to thy face* (defiantly); so 6[28] 21[31]. In 2[5] אל־פניך, with variants על־פ׳. 𝔊 in 1[11] 2[5] 6[28] *εἰς*, in 21[31] *ἐπί*.

12. בידך] *in thy hand*, that is, *in thy power*, to do what thou wilt with him; cf. Gn. 16[6]. So 2[6].

רק] 𝔊 *ἀλλά*; 2[6] אך, 𝔊 *μόνον*.

אליו אל תשלח ידך] *αὐτοῦ μὴ ἅψῃ* = אליו אל תגע: cf. v.[11] 2[5]. Both idioms are good Hebrew: for 𝔐, cf. Ex. 24[11].

מעם פני] *From* (*being*) *in the presence of* (cf. Gn. 44[29]) is, like מאת פני (2[7]), which is also very rare (Ex. 10[11], and, followed by a definition of place, Lv. 10[4], and, somewhat differently, 2 K. 16[14]), a more expressive equivalent of מאת or מעם which are commonly used without פני.

13. אכלים ו׳] 𝔊 om.: with 𝔐, cf. vv.[4. 18].

אכלים ושתים] *were eating and drinking*; Dr. § 135 (1); in v.[24] the parts. are used with היו: Dr. *ib.* (5).

יין] cf. v.[18]; ct. v.[4]. יין is absent from S both here and in v.[18], from 𝔊 in v.[18]; and in 𝔐 is probably an explanatory addition, though the omission in MS [Ken.] 30 in v.[13], and MSS [Ken.] 111, 384 in v.[18], is less probably continuous correct tradition than an accidental return to the original text through a late accidental omission.

14. ומלאך] *καὶ ἰδοὺ ἄγγελος* = והנה מלאך.

בא] pf. (and so in vv.[16. 17. 18]), not part.: for the cstr. ויהי . . . ומלאך בא, cf. Gn. 7[10] 22[1], and see Dr. § 78 (3).

ויאמר] 𝔊 + *αὐτῷ*: 𝔖 (and so in vv.[16. 17. 18]) ܠܗ: these are mere amplifications. In 𝔊 in vv.[16. 17. 18] the plus is *πρὸς Ἰώβ* (with variants).

חרשות] the fem. cannot be very satisfactorily explained. In Gn. 33[13] milch kine are referred to, and the fem. is natural; here female cattle are not even principally involved. Ct. the masc. part. in 1 Ch. 27[26]; and note the masculines in 𝔖 here, ܬܘܪܐ ܕܕܒܪܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܦܕܢܐ. Bu. suggests that חרשות is due to miscopying חרשים under the influence of two following words in ־ות; if this were the case, the masc. suffixes in על־ידיהם and ותקחם would be at once explained: otherwise they must be explained in accordance with G–K. 135*o*: then cp. חבליהם, 39[3] and (after בנות) להם, אביהם and אחיהם in 42[15].

על־ידיהם] *alongside of them*; על־ידי (and also על־יד) meaning *by the side(s) of*, is more commonly followed by a geographical term: cf. *e.g.* Nu. 34[3] with n. there. For the masc. suffix see last n.; it is improbable that the reading על ידיהן in 5 MSS [Ken.] represents the original text.

15. ותפל] fem. with the name of a country used as the name of a people: G–K. 122*i*. For נפל, *to fall upon*, *attack*, cf. Josh. 11[7] (with ב); here the personal obj. with בְּ is dispensed with, the expression of the obj. in ותקחם sufficing.

ואמלטה] Dr. § 69; G–K. 49*e*.

רק אני לבדי] 𝔊 *ἐγὼ μόνος*, 𝔖 ܐܢܐ ܒܠܚܘܕܝ, and so vv.[16. 17. 19]. It would be very unwise to infer from these versions that 𝔐 at any time lacked רק; on the other hand, cf. Gn. 47[26], where 𝔖 also has for רק . . . לבד only ܒܠܚܘܕ.

16. זה . . . זה] cf. 21[23. 25]; and also, *e.g.*, Gn. 29[27], Ps. 75[8]: and see BDB., *s.v.* זה, 1[b].

אש אלהים נפלה מן־השמים] with אש אלהים cf. אש יהוה, Nu. 11[1. 3], 1 K. 18[38] (ותפל אש י״י ותאכל); with אש . . . מן הש׳, cf. 2 K. 1[10. 12a. 14]. With the combination of the two definitions of the lightning-fire found here in 𝔐, but not in 𝔊, from which אלהים is absent, cf. 2 K. 1[12b] in most Hebrew MSS (but 11 MSS and also 𝔊𝔗𝔙 om. אלהים), 1 K. 18[38] (𝔊𝔏, but not 𝔐); see also Gn. 19[24] אש מאת יהוה מן השמים. As in 2 K. 1[12b],

so here the shorter text of 𝔊 may be the original. 𝔊[A] adds *ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν*—another form of amplification.

בנערים] 𝔊 *τοὺς ποιμένας* and 𝔖 ܒ̈ܥܘܬܐ do not point to a variant בָּרֹעִים, but are interpretations: and so in v.[19] הנערים is interpreted *τὰ παιδία σου* and ܛ̈ܠܝܟ.

17. כשדים] as פלשתים generally, so is כשדים often used without the art.; so regularly in אור־כשדים, but see also, *e.g.* 2 K. 25[4ff.], Jer. 37[10]. 𝔊 *οἱ ἱππεῖς* may be an interpretation due to regarding the Chaldæans as cavalry *par excellence* (cf. Hab. 1[6ff.], Jer. 6[23]). In any case such a reading as פרשים would have no claim to acceptance.

ראשים] (military) *companies*, Jg. 7[20] 9[34], 1 S. 11[11] (with vb. שים as here) 13[17].

ויפשטו על] *made a raid upon, fell as plunderers upon*: cf. Jg. 9[33 (44)] 20[37] (אל), where the attack is made from ambush, and 1 S. 27[8] 30[1.] (both אל) [14], where the attack is the prelude to plunder. Even if the meaning in the passages cited developed from the root meaning *to strip*, because such an attack was regarded as a *putting off of* (one's shelter), as BDB. suggest (cf. Moore on Jg. 9[33]), the sense of emergence from shelter can have been felt very faintly if at all in the passages cited from Sam. or here: cf. also Hos. 7[1] (without על).

18. עד] point עֹד: it is altogether improbable that the original writer intended עֹד in vv.[16. 17], but עַד (MT) here, nor very probable that he intended עַד throughout; though for the possibility of this see BDB., *s.v.* עַד, ii. 2. Some MSS read עוד here.

ויין] omit: cf. v.[13] n.

19. מעבר] *from the* (*far*) *side of*, expressing much the same idea as, but expressing it less strongly than, our phrase *sweeping across*: cf. Is. 21[1].

ויגע] strictly ותגע is required; but see G–K. 145*t*, for examples of vbs. more remote from a fem. subj. being masc. For נגע ב of wind, cf. Ezk. 17[10].

הנערים] in vv.[15. 16. 17] of Job's servants (cf. *e.g.* Nu. 22[22], RV. *servants*); here of his children (cf. 29[5]; also, *e.g.*, 1 S. 16[11], RV. *thy children*) primarily, though perhaps with the inclusion

of the servants attending them of whom the messenger is the only one to escape. Indeed the repetition here, with a different sense, of the same term that is used in vv.[15. 16. 17] may be due partly to the fact that it was capable of a more inclusive meaning than בניך (v.[18]), partly to the desire to maintain the greatest possible verbal similarity in the messages of the four messengers.

20. ראשו] 𝔊^A + καὶ κατεπάσατο γῆν ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς αὐτοῦ from 2[12]: cf. a similar but fragmentary addition in ^Ken. 196, which adds ויזרקו before ויפל.

וישתחו] 𝔊^A al. + τῷ κυρίῳ.

21. ערם] acc. of the state placed first with emphasis: cf. *e.g.* Am. 2[16], and see G–K. 118*n*.

יצתי] for יצאתי; G–K. 23*f*, 74*k*.

שמה] cf. שם in 3[17. 19].

יהוה] subj. placed first for emphasis.

לקח] 𝔊 + ὡς τῷ κυρίῳ ἔδοξεν οὕτως ἐγένετο.

22. איוב] 𝔊 + ἐναντίον τοῦ κυρίου (^A al. + οὐδὲ ἐν τοῖς χείλεσιν αὐτοῦ); 4 MSS ^Ken. + בשפתיו (cf. 2[10]). Amplifications.

לא נתן תפלה לא׳] the verbal idiom is as in (עז, תודה) נתן כבד לי״י (1 S. 6[5], Jos. 7[19], Ps. 68[35]), *to give*, i.e. *ascribe*, *glory* (*praise*, *strength*) *to Yahweh*, *i.e.* to acknowledge that Yahweh is glorious, praiseworthy, or strong; cf. also 1 S. 18[8], where *they have given to me thousands* means they have given Saul credit for having slain thousands. It is plain from the context that תפלה is a quality, or mode of conduct or the like, that is not and ought not to be in God: and the sentence asserts that Job does not discredit God by asserting that he has displayed this quality: in English idiom Job *charged not God with* (RV.) תפלה. But what precisely is תפלה? We must dismiss the view that it should be pointed תְּפִלָּה, which Ehrlich maintains only by attributing to תְּפִלָּה the unsupported and improbable meaning *protest*. In 24[12], on the other hand, תְּפִלָּה (𝔖) may be preferred to תִּפְלָה (MT). The root of תִּפְלָה must be תפל; apart from תפל in Ezk. 13[10ff. 14ff.] 22[28], which has the same meaning as טפל, *plaister*, and the proper names תפל and אחיתפל, the root appears in the OT. only in the forms

תִּפְלָה here, 24[12] (?), Jer. 23[13], and תפל, 6[6], La. 2[14]; in NH. the forms תפלות and the denom. vb. also appear (cf. in Aram. the Ithpa.); تفل occurs with various shades of meaning in Arabic. The fundamental meaning of the Semitic root seems to have been *to be savourless* (through the loss of savour); the various meanings collected by Lane for تفل may have developed in this order: (1) to (lose a good scent by the) neglect (of) perfume, (2) to be unperfumed, (3) to be ill-smelling, (4) to spit out (rejecting what is ill-savoured): Lane cites ذاق ماء البحر فتفله, *he tasted the water of the sea and spat it out*, (5) to spit (whence further meanings developed). In Hebrew the meaning *tasteless* is clear in תפל, Jb. 6[6]: cf. דג מליח, *salted fish*, in contrast to דג תפל, *unsalted fish* (Shab. 128[a]). Thence of moral savourlessness, or unsavouriness (cf. Arabic (4)); so in La. 2[14] (תפל coupled with שוא), Jer. 23[13] (תפלה), and with various differences of nuance in later Hebrew, as in the following cited from Levy, *NHB* iv. 659*a*, *b*, and *Chald. Wörterbuch*, 549*a*. דברי תפלות שתפלה על המן (cf. 𝔗[O] איתפלו על מנא), *the unseemly things which they unseemly spoke about the manna*; נשיקה של תפלות, *an immodest kiss*; and see, further, *Soṭa* 3[4] for תפל of indulgence, absence of control in women. Thus to ascribe תפלה to Yahweh should imply regarding him as having lost the moral savour or quality which had been characteristic of him, and thus is near akin to הפר משפטי (40[8]) on one interpretation of that phrase; it is thus more expressive than conjectural emendations which have been suggested for תפלה, such as עולה or נבלה (Beer); similarly in Jer., Yahweh sees in the prophets תפלה, or moral deterioration: they still prophesy, but not by Yahweh, not so as to lead the people aright, but by Baal, and so as to lead the people astray. The Versions in any case, as Beer admits, give no justification for emending תפלה away here; the exact flavour of the Hebrew is difficult to preserve in a translation, but 𝔊's ἀφροσύνη, here and also in La. 2[14], is a tolerable attempt to reproduce the transferred moral sense of the word.

CHAPTER II.

1. להתיצב על יהוה (2)] 𝔊 om.: the last clause of the v. in Swete (*i.e.* in $^{B\ al.}$) is from Aq. Theod.; see Field. In 𝔐 the words are a dittograph; for ct. 1^6. Di. Bu., however, consider the absence from 𝔊 to be due to religious scruples against making the Satan quite like the other angels; in that case Beer would add the clause also to 1^6 (so 𝔖).

2. אי מזה] 1^7 מאין.

ויען . . . ויאמר] 𝔊 *τότε εἶπεν*: ct. 1^7 *καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς* . . . *εἶπεν.* Whether 𝔊's text was actually shorter than 𝔐 is not quite certain; the variation as between 1^7 and 2^1 may be due to desire for variety: note that the remainder of the v. is also differently rendered, and that neither rendering is literal.

3. לבך] Beer claims that this is omitted in 𝔊: ct. 1^8; but this is not quite certain, for there are further variations in 1^8 and 2^3 𝔊: cf. last n. and see on 1^8.

ועדנו מחזיק בתמתו ותסיתני בו לבלעו חנם] the exact relation of these two sentences is not clear; waw conv. with the impf. cannot express *although*, *in spite of*; RV., therefore, must be abandoned. The waw conv. can be best explained if we translate: ***And he still maintains his integrity*, *and so*** (Dr. § 74*a*) ***in vain hast thou enticed me against him to ruin him*** (G–K. 111*l*; cf. Kön. 369*h*); but, if this were intended, the position of חנם is strange; this might, therefore, be rejected more confidently, if the alternative were quite satisfactory: ***He still maintains . . . and yet*** (Dr. § 74 (β)) ***thou hast enticed***, etc. Dr. (§ 79) appears to refer the second clause to what is yet to come; he compares Jer. 38^9 השליכו אל הבור וימת, (they have cast him into the pit) ***and he is going on to die***, Ps. 29^{10}; so here, ***and thou art enticing me.***

ותסיתני ב׳] cf. 1 S. 26^19, 2 S. 24^1.

לבלעו] 𝔊 τὰ ὑπάρχοντα αὐτοῦ . . . ἀπολέσαι, correctly interpreting the suffix so as to limit the ruin to the goods or property of Job; on בלע see Is. 3^12 n.

4. לְאִישׁ] 𝔊 ἀνθρώπῳ, 𝔗 בר נש, suggest לָאִישׁ: for which also 𝔖 ܠܓܒܪܐ might stand (cf. Ca. 8^7 𝔖). The punctuation of MT may be due to regarding לאיש as referring to Job (cf. 1^1. 8), and כל אשר לאיש as = כל אשר לו (cf. 1^10. 11). In the very similar sentence in Ca. 8^7, 𝔐 is clearly anarthrous; yet with 𝔐 here, cf. 1 S. 9^9.

עור בעד עור] not a form of expressing the *lex talionis*, for the prep. used in Ex. 21^23f., Lv. 24^18. 20 is תחת *in place of*, *in compensation for*, and in Dt. 19^21 ב *pretii*, and there is no evidence that בעד could be substituted for either of those. Either (1) בעד has here its common metaph. meaning, *on behalf of* (cf. *e.g.* Is. 8^19, 2 S. 12^16), and then the meaning of the clause is completed by the vb. (יתן) in the next cl. (cf. Jg. 15^16); or, more probably, the clause being a proverbial saying, some such vb. as יתן is to be understood; in either case we must render: *(one) skin (will a man give) on behalf of (another) skin*; or (2) בעד has its literal meaning *upon* or *about* (Jon. 2^7, Ps. 3^4 139^11), and we should render with Schultens, Merx, Bu., *one skin (lies) upon (another) skin.*

וכל] 𝔊 om. ו.

6, 7a. Cf. 1^12 nn.

7b. עד] K^e thibh: ועד, Q^e rê 𝔖𝔗.

8. לו] not translated by 𝔊.

בתוך האפר] 𝔊 + ἔξω τῆς πόλεως—a correct, but for native readers an unnecessary gloss.

9. ותאמר] 𝔊 prefixes χρόνου δὲ πολλοῦ προβεβηκότος.

עדך וגו] interrogative: G–K. 150*a*. For עדך 𝔊 has μέχρι τίνος: whence Merx, עד־אן (cf. 8^2).

ברך] see 1^5 n. Before this word 𝔊 has a long insertion, on which see Introd.

10. ויאמר אליה] 𝔊 ὁ δὲ ἐμβλέψας εἶπεν αὐτῇ.

כדבר . . . תדברי] cf. כנפל . . . נפלת, 2 S. 3^34; with

אחת הנבלות in comparison, cf. כאחד הנבלים, 2 S. 13[13]; כאחד הצבים, 2 S. 2[18]; כאחד השרים, Ps. 82[7]. These parallels do not favour the reading of 2 MSS (cf. 𝔖𝔗𝔙, but ct. 𝔊), כאחת מן־הנ׳.

תדברי] has possibly arisen, through a dittograph of the ת of נבלות and the misreading of ת at the end, from דִּבַּרְתְּ; cf. 𝔊's ἐλάλησας (though this in itself is, of course, inconclusive), 𝔖 ܡܠܠܬܝ; the pf. seems preferable, since the allusion is to the words just spoken, not to the wife's customary speech. If the impf. be retained, render: *wilt thou, too, speak?* (Du., and see next n.).

גם] absent in 2 MSS Ken.; cf. 𝔖. 𝔊 εἰ = אם, does not necessarily point to a variant, for note the equivalents of גם in Is. 49[15. 25], 1 S. 22[6] to which Beer refers. The גם is to be explained as emphasizing את הטוב; so BDB. 169*a*; it strengthens the emphasis secured by the position of את־הטוב and its antithesis to את־הרע; cp. Nu. 22[23]. G–K. 153 treat גם as being "placed before two co-ordinate sentences, although, strictly speaking, it applies only to the second"; but Mal. 1[10] is a doubtful support for this usage, and the analogy of such uses as that of מדוע in Is. 5[4] and others cited in 150*m*, are scarcely exact. Hence Merx, Sieg. prefer to point גַּם אַתְּ, connecting these words with the preceding: (*wilt*) *thou, too,* (*speak*). In this case, however, it becomes necessary either to read גם אַתְּ אֶת הטוב (Sieg., Du. Be[K]), or to omit the את before הרע; the latter is preferable, *if* the words of Job form two distichs 3 : 2 (Du.).

נקבל] קבל for לקח is a remarkable Aramaism found elsewhere in OT. only in Ch. Ezr. Est. and Pr. 19[20]. The inf. in an entirely different sense occurs in P—Ex. 26[5] 36[12] †.

איוב] at this point 𝔖 repeats 1[22b]; the addition is also found after בשפתיו in 3 MSS of 𝔊 (H. and P.).

11. רעי איוב] 𝔊 φίλοι αὐτοῦ = רעיו.

הזאת] 𝔊𝔙 om.

הבאה] accented in MT on the penultimate, as if 3rd pers. pf. preceded by the art. used as a relative; but it is improbable that this represents the intention of the author (cf. G–K. 138*k*, and Dr.'s n. on 1 S. 9[24]): note 𝔊 τὰ ἐπελθόντα.

וּבִלְדַּד] 𝔊 *Βαλδάδ*: the punctuation of 𝔊 may be more correct than MT: for 𝔊's omission of the ו, cf. 1[1] n.

הַנַּעֲמָתִי] *ὁ Μειναίων βασιλεύς*; for *βασιλεύς*, cf. *Ἐλειφὰζ ὁ Θαιμανῶν βασ.* and *Βαλδὰδ ὁ Σαυχαίων τύραννος*. In 11[1] and throughout the book 𝔊 has for הנעמתי, *ὁ Μειναῖος*.

12. וַיִּזְרְקוּ] זרק, usually of liquids, but also of cummin (Is. 28[25]), soot (Ex. 9[8. 10]), dust (implicitly; 2 Ch. 34[4]), coals (Ezk. 10[2]), means to throw or toss in quantities (see Dr.'s nn. on Ex. 29[16], Am. 6[6]), such as fistfuls or handfuls.

עַל־רָאשֵׁיהֶם הַשָּׁמָיְמָה] 𝔊 om., though *ἐπὶ τὰς κεφαλὰς (αὐτῶν)* is supplied in some MSS of 𝔊 (*e.g.* [A]) from Theod. (see Syro-hex.); and from the same source *in cælum* is also added in 𝔍. The original text of 𝔊 can scarcely represent the original text of 𝔐; on the other hand, 𝔐 is curious: it is commonly understood to mean: *they tossed dust towards heaven*, *i.e.*, in English idiom, *up into the air* (cf. Saʿad, في الهواء), so that it might in descending fall *upon their heads*; but for this we should at least have expected the order of על־ראשיהם השמימה to have been reversed. The phrase זרק השמימה occurs again in Ex. 9[8. 10] (P); on the other hand, the rite of putting dust on the head is nowhere else expressed by this vb.; the usual phrase is העלה . . . על ראש: see Jos. 7[6], La. 2[10], Ezk. 27[30]. It is difficult to account for השמימה as a gloss (so apparently Beer[K] with a ?); on the other hand, the omission of על־ראשיהם, which might easily be attributed to a glossator, would leave a phrase of questionable pertinence here. On the whole, therefore, the least hazardous alternative is to retain the text of 𝔐.

13. לָאָרֶץ] 𝔊, also 2 MSS [Ken.], om.

וְשִׁבְעַת לֵילוֹת] not in the original text of 𝔊: see Beer.

CHAPTER III.

2. [ויען איוב] 𝔊𝔙 om.; and 𝔐 may be due to assimilation to the corresponding introductory formulæ in cc. 4–26 (Be.); yet see exeg. n. *Καὶ ἀπεκρίθη Ἰὼβ* in $𝔊^{A}$ is from Aq. Theod.]

[וַיֹּאמַ֑ר (*milʿēl*)]. The pausal form of וַיֹּאמֶר is usually וַיֹּאמַר ($1^{7.9}$ etc.); but at the beginning of the speeches in Job it is always וַיֹּ֫אמַר (4^{1} 6^{1} etc.); only in 32^{6} is it וַיֹּאמַ֑ר: cf. G–K. 68*e*, and see H. F. B. Compston in *JThS* xiii. 426 f.

3. "In אֹבַד, אִוָּלֶד, הֹרָה the tone is thrown back to prevent the collision of two tone-syllables (G–K. 29*e*), and to produce a rhythmical accent, as happens very frequently, esp. before the last arsis: cf. vv.$^{5c.\ 8a.\ 14a.\ 16b.\ 17a.\ b.\ 20b.\ 25b.\ 26b}$ etc." (Bu.).

[יום] without the art., the word (in *st. c.*) being defined by the foll. relative clause (G–K. 130*d*, esp. the second part; *Lex.* 400*a*, cases with יוֹם and יְמֵי: *e.g.* Ps. $56^{4.10}$).

[אִוָּלֶד בּוֹ] the impf., as often in poetry, depicting vividly a single past action (cf. v.^{11a} 15^{7}, Ex. $15^{5.6.7.15}$; Dr. 27*a*; G–K. 107*b*). The force of the tense must be *felt* by the Heb. student: idiom will not permit its reproduction in English. It really designates the action as *in progress* (though not so distinctly as the ptcp. does); but such renderings as *was being born*, or *was going to be born*, not only make too much of the tense, but lack altogether the delicacy and fineness of the Heb. idiom. Jer. (20^{14}) expresses the same thought in the language of prose: ארור היום אשר יֻלַּדְתִּי בו.

[הלילה אמר] "the night (which) said": G–K. 155*f*, Kö. iii. 380*d*: cf. Ps. 34^{9} 52^{9} 118^{24}, 2 S. 23^{1}.

[הֹרָה] Pu. of הָרָה; only here. Prob. to be regarded as a passive of Ḳal (see G–K. 52*e*).

[הרה גבר] So 𝔖𝔙𝔗; but 𝔊 *Ἰδοὺ ἄρσεν*. *Ἰδού* (unless

חרה was read as חֲרֵי, Mishnic for *behold*) will point to הִנֵּה for חרה; *ἄρσεν*, however, in spite of Jer. 20[15] (. . . לאמר יֻלַּד־לְךָ בֵּן זָכָר), is more probably a paraphrase of גבר than based upon a reading זכר. [Yet note that גבר is regularly rendered in Job by *ἀνήρ* (10 times), and once by *ἄνθρωπος*, never in Job or elsewhere by *ἄρσην*. The term זכר is prosaic; yet in a similar connection to the present does actually occur in poetry: see Is. 66[7].]

4. [היום] 𝔊 *ἡ νύξ*; Symm. Theod. 𝔊 [ℵc. b AC al.] *ἡ ἡμέρα*. See exeg. n. Bi. Be. om. all 4*a*.]

[יְהִי חֹשֶׁךְ] cf. 5[1] 17[16] 24[24] 33[9], Ps. 1[3]. When a word has Ole-we-yored, Great Rebiaʿ, or Deḥi, without a preceding conj. accent, and begins with sh'wa, this sh'wa has a gaʿya, provided that between the sh'wa and the tone-syll. there is at least one vowel, and this has not already a sh'wa. See Baer in Merx, *Archiv*, i. 202 f.; more briefly G–K. 16*g*, *end*.

[ידרשהו] דרש is to *seek after*, hence to *inquire after* (RVm.), then show solicitude for, *care for*; so Dt. 11[12] RV., Jer. 30[17] RVm., Is. 62[12] דרושה (EVV. *sought out*).

[ממעל] either *from above*, 31[2] (|| מִמְּרוֹמִים), or *above*, 31[28] (כי כחשתי לאל ממעל), and often in בשמים ממעל, Dt. 4[39] al.

[נהרה †] cf. 𝔗 נְהוֹר, Syr. ܢܘܗܪܐ. The *fem.* form shows, however, that the word has become Hebraized. Elsewhere in Heb. the √ means to *shine* only in the vb., Is. 60[5], Ps. 34[6] †.

5. [יגאלהו] גאל to *claim*, *redeem* (*v. supr.*): so 𝔊 *ἐκλάβοι*, Σ *ἀντιποιήσαιτο αὐτῆς*, Θ *ἀγχιστευσάτω αὐτῆς* (from the redeemer of a claim being commonly the nearest of kin); cf. AVm. *challenge it* (i.e. *claim it*; see Aldis Wright, *Bible Word-Book*, *s.v.*) 𝔗 יטננון יתיה, 'Α *μολύναι* (cf. 𝔖𝔙, paraphrasing, ܢܛܢܦܘܗ, obscurent) derive it from the late גאל, to *defile*, Is. 59[3] al.; so Rabb., AV. *stain it*. But the metaphor does not harmonize with the context.

[תִּשְׁכָּן־עָלָיו] the "heavy Gaʿyā" is inserted (Baer, in Merx, *Archiv*, i., "*Die Metheg-Setzung*," p. 200) in the first syll. of the sg. impf. Qal of the regular verb, when it ends with *Qameṣ*, and is joined by *Maḳḳef* to the foll. word, to emphasize the syll. in which it stands, and to help to shorten the pronunc. of the

ֽ: so 22[8] 24[14] 38[19], Ps. 121[8], Pr. 4[4] (cf. G–K. 16*g*, *h*, though this particular instance is not mentioned).

עֲנָנָה †] the fem. is prob. collective (G–K. 122*s*).

צַלְמָוֶת] "shadow of death": so, as vocalized by 𝔊 (σκιὰ θανάτου), Vrss., the Massoretes, Ges. *Thes.*; but most modern scholars צַלְמוּת (from √ צלם* Eth. *ṣalma* (Di. *Lex.* 1258*f*), to *be dark*, Ar. ظَلِمَ, iv, to *be dark*; ظُلْمَة, *darkness* (in Qor. often in the pl. *ẓulumāt*, 2[16] 6[1] etc.), Ass. *ṣalmu*, *black*)—a reading and etym. presupposed by RVm. *deep darkness.* If 𝔐 be right, the word will be one of the very few examples of a compound word in Heb. (G–K. 30*r*, 81*d* with n.). The traditional vocalization has been defended recently by no less an authority than Nöldeke (*ZAW*, 1897, p. 183 ff.). Nöld., in answer to the argument (Di. here) that shade is to Orientals a fig. of refreshment (Is. 16[3] 25[4] 32[2]), which does not suit death, observes that this depends on what object casts it, and the "shadow of death" would not be like the grateful shadow of a rock in the Oriental noon: he also points out that צלמות occurs in late Heb.—in Ps. 44[20] even in the 2nd cent. B.C.—so that 𝔊 σκιὰ θανάτου is not likely to represent a false tradition; and, lastly, he remarks that a word ending in ות- is not likely to have been formed from a √ not known to have been in use in Heb. or even in Aramaic. The argument drawn from 𝔊 is hardly cogent; else what is to be said of εἰς τὸ τέλος for לַמְנַצֵּחַ, ἡ κλητή for מִקְרָא (in the Pent.), and ἡ σκηνὴ τοῦ μαρτυρίου for אהל מועד? Nor does the last argument seem to be conclusive: there are many words in Heb. derived from roots found in Arabic, but not *known* to have been in use in the Hebrew spoken in OT. times, as איתן, דביר, מעון, מלאך, מעצר, מקלט, תלאובות. "Shadow of death" would have been more probable, had the expression itself been more obviously suggestive of Sheol, and had it not also been often used to denote darkness (*e.g.* that of night: c. 24[17], Am. 5[8]; of a mine, 28[3]) of a kind to which no thought whatever of either death or Sheol could attach: "shadow of death," in the sense of the shadow cast by approaching death, which a modern reader might attach to it in (*e.g.*) Jb. 16[16], is (as other passages show) not the

idea expressed by צלמות. The other occurrences of the word are $10^{21.22}$ 38^{17} (only in these passages of the darkness of Sheol) 12^{22} 16^{16} 24^{17} 28^{3} 34^{22}, Is. 9^{1}, Jer. 2^{6} 13^{16}, Am. 5^{8}, Ps. 23^{4} 44^{20} $107^{10.14}$ †: *v.* further *Lex. s.v.*

כִּמְרִירֵי] *the like of* (*Lex.* 453*a*) *the bitternesses of the day* (so 𝔗 Aq. Jer.; Mass.) yields no sense: read כַּמְרִירֵי, *the blacknesses of*, from the sense of כמר in Syr. (כמירא, *black*, of a cloud, the night, Sheol, etc.; PS. 1757; the form, as חכליל, סגריר, שפריר, G–K. 84*b*, No. 34).

6. יִחַדְּ] from חָדָה (G–K. 75*r*), common in Aram., but otherwise in Heb. only Ex. 18^{9} וַיִּחַדְּ (E), Ps. 21^{7} תְּחַדֵּהוּ; cf. the subst. חֶדְוָה, 1 Ch. 16^{27} (‖ Ps. 96^{6} תפארת), Neh. 8^{10}, Ezr. 6^{16} †. 𝔊 εἴη (= יְהִי); 𝔗 יחיד, Σ συναφθείη, Saad. يجتمع, *i.e.* יֵחַד (from יָחַד: cf. תֵּחַד, sq. ב, as here, Gn. 49^{6}), *be united, joined.*

8. עתיד] *prepared, ready*: cf. 15^{24} עָתִיד לַכִּידוֹר, Est. 3^{14} 8^{13} עתידים ליום הזה. The √ is rare, and mostly late, in OT. (Pr. 24^{27} וְעַתְּדָהּ; Jb. 15^{28} התעתדו לגלים), but common in Aram. and NH. (Dn. 3^{15}; cf. on Dt. 32^{35}): in Syr. 𝔗 עַתֵּד is to *prepare*, אתעתד, to *be prepared*; עָתִיד is *prepared, ready* (PS. 3008), in NH. esp. = μέλλων, as in הֶעָתִיד לָבוֹא = ὁ μέλλων [αἰών]. We should expect לעורר; but cf. the inf. without ל not only after הוסיף, 27^{1} al., הֵחֵל, Dt. 2^{25} al., יָכֹל, c. 4^{2} al., but also after נתן פ׳ (= *allow* . . . *to*: *Lex.* 679*a*), Nu. 20^{21} 21^{23}; נִלְאָה, Is. 1^{14} al.; חדל, Is. 1^{16}; אָבָה, Is. 28^{12} al.; האמין, c. 15^{22} (G–K. 114*m*; Kö. iii. 576).

9. וָאַיִן] idiomatic for ואיננו, esp. after such words as קִוָּה and בִּקֵּשׁ: 1 S. 9^{4}, Is. 41^{17} 59^{11}, Ezk. 7^{25}, Ps. 69^{21}.

10. ויסתר] the force of לא (in ᵃ) extending over both clauses, as [Ps. 44^{19}]: cf. G–K. 152*z*.

11. למה לא] See G–K. 20*f*.

אמות] (why) *went I not on to die* from the womb? A good case of the incipient sense of the impf., noticed on v.³.

מרחם] מן temporal usually denotes *continuously after*, Ps. 22^{11} etc. (*Lex.* 581*a*, 4a); for מן = *immediately after*, cf. Hos. 6^{2} מִיֹּמָיִם, al. (*Lex.* 581*b*, 4b), Ps. 73^{20} כַּחֲלוֹם מֵהָקִיץ (Bu.).

יצאתי] the force of למה לא extending over the second

clause, even without a connecting וְ: cf. after למה, עד מה, etc. Ps. 10[1. 13] 44[25] 62[4] 79[5] etc., and on 1 S. 2[3]; and after לא, G–K. 152*z*.

ואגוע] By all analogy we should expect וָאֶגְוַע; and, "though there seems no doubt that according to the Mass. tradition the strong *waw* received in some cases a lighter pronunciation" (Dav. § 51, R.[6] though he himself, § 45, R.[2], seems to explain the tense of וְאֶגְוַע by attraction to [a] אמות), this doubtless ought to be read. So Is. 43[28] 48[3] 51[2] 57[17] al.; cf. G–K. 107*b*, n. גוע, to *expire*,—only in poetry (8 times in Job; La. 1[19], Zec. 13[8], Ps. 88[16] 104[29] †), and the prose of P (12 times).

13. כי עתה] see Ex. 9[15] (Dr. § 141; *Lex.* 774*b*, g).

ואשקוט] Read 'וָא: cf. v.[11] n.

אז ינוח] "then *were I* (now) *at rest.*" נוח impers. (Dav. § 109; G–K. 144*b*), as Is. 23[12].

[14. חרבות למו] in addition to the suggestions considered in the exegetical n., note Che.'s emendation קברות עולם, *everlasting sepulchres* (*Exp.T.* x. 380); and Daiches' interpretation of 'ח as *fortresses*, *cities*, on the ground that מחרב with that meaning occurs in the S. Arabian inscriptions (*JQR*, 1908, 607 ff.).]

16. לא אהיה] The impf., as v.[13] ינוח. Hi. Be.[T] לא היה (א in אהיה, dittographed), *which came not into being*; but the sentence then (Bu.) has no predicate. Wr. Bu. omit לא ("or I should be like," etc.), supposing it to have come in as a reminiscence of 10[19]; but there is no gain by the change. Reiske, Be., Du. may, however, be right in transposing [16] to follow [11] (under the government of למה, [11a]); the position suits; and שם, [17], is not then separated from [14. 15], to which it obviously refers.

17. רשעים] Be.[T] רְעָשִׁים, against which see Bu.

רֹגֶז] lit. (חדל being *intrans.*) "cease *with regard to* raging"; cf. חדלו הָרֵעַ, Is. 1[16], and on v.[8] above. רְגֹז would be more regular, and prob. ought to be read; perhaps, however, the punct. רֹגֶז was determined by the rhythm.

18. יחד] Note that יחד and יחדו often stand emphatically at

the *beginning* of a clause: 16^{10} 19^{12} 21^{26} 24^{4}, Ps. 41^{8} 98^{8} al., Is. $11^{7.14}$ 41^{1} al. (*Lex.* 403*a*, *b*).

19. שם הוא] The rend. "are there the same" [Bu., G–K. § 135*a*, note] is very doubtful. אני הוא means *I am He* (emph.), i.e. *He Who is*, which may be *paraphrased by* "I am the same" (*Lex.* 16*b*); but הוא nowhere in itself *means* "the same"; and that *two* persons should be identified by the use of הוא is most improbable. The pred. must be שם, not הוא, the sentence being exactly like חלום פרעה אחד הוא, etc. (Dr. § 198; *Lex.* 216*a*). For "are the same" we should expect כגדל כקטן (or כם קטן) (*Lex.* 454, כְּ, 2).

מאדניו] For the pl. see G–K. 124*i*.

20. יתן] The subj. may be either הַנֹּתֵן (G–K. 144*e*; Dr. on 1 S. 16^{4}) or "he," *i.e.* God: in either case God being equally the subject whom Job has in his mind. In the former case, the sense may in our idiom be expressed by ". . . *is given*" (so EVV; also 𝔊𝔖𝔗𝔙); and Be. Du. would *read* יֻתַּן; but the covert reference to God is better expressed by יִתֵּן.

21. ויחפרהו] the finite vb. carrying on המחכים; G–K. 116*x*.

ממטמנים] 𝔊𝔖𝔙 'כְּמ; so Be. Du.; but this is necessary only if חפר be taken to mean "dig" (𝔊𝔙 Be. Du.).

22. אֱלֵי גיל] cf. Hos. 9^{1} [𝔊 אל חגל] אל תשמח ישראל אל גיל: אֱלֵי poet. for אל, as 5^{26} 15^{22} 29^{19} † (cf. עֲלֵי, עֲדֵי). Grä. Be. Du., partly for the sake of the parallelism, partly on the ground that ישישו is a bathos (?) after השמחים אלי גיל, would read [with one MS $^{\text{Ken.}}$ and $𝔖^{vid.}$] גַּל, "who rejoice over the *grave-heap*"; but there is no evidence that גל alone would have this meaning; we have only גל אבנים, a "heap *of stones*," so used (Jos. 7^{26} 8^{29}, 2 S. 18^{17}), and that not of an ordinary grave.

23. ויסך] Hif. from סוך, as 38^{8} † (where, however, read וּמִי סָךְ); 1^{10} שַׂכְתָּ from שׂוך [see n. on 1^{10}].

24. לפני naturally means *before*: but *before my bread*, *i.e.* before every meal, yields a poor sense. Ew. Hi. Di. De. suppose that לפני acquired the sense of *pro*, i.e. *for*, or *instead of*: cf. 4^{19}, 1 S. 1^{16} (if the text here is correct). Bu. suggests tentatively כְּפִי, Be. לְפִי, *in proportion to* (*Lex.* 805*b*); but this

is prosaic and almost too precise to be probable here. Bi.[2] כְּלַחְמִי (for כי לי לי).

ויתכו] masc. before the fem. שאנתי: G–K. 145*p*. Bu. for וַיִּתְּכוּ would read וְיִתכוּ (as in many parallel cases in Job); but there are numerous instances of the impf., with a freq. force, being followed by וַיִּ (Dr. 80; G–K. 111*t*).

25a. The sentence is *virtually* hypothetical, though no hypoth. particle is used: cf. Pr. 11^{2} בא זדון ויבא קלון, "pride *has come, and* shame *goes* on to come," *i.e.* when one comes the other comes (Dr. 153; G–K. 159*h*): so c. 9^{20b} 23^{13} 29^{11}, cf. 7^{8b} 27^{19b}. 𝔊𝔖𝔗𝔙 Bi. Be. om. וְ (the fear that I fear cometh upon me); [so Σ, but not 'ΑΘ (see Field, *Hex. ad loc.*)].

ויאתיני] The original ל״א being retained (G–K. 75*u*). The accus. ־ני, as with בוא, 15^{21} 20^{22} al. (G–K. 118*f*).

26. שָׁלַוְתִּי] The one ל״ו vb. in Heb. with the ו preserved in Qal; G–K. 75*b* (cf. *kk*).

CHAPTER IV.

2. נִסָּה] has been taken (*a*) as the 1 pl. impf. Ḳal from נָשָׂא (cf. נְסָה for נְשָׂא, Ps. 4^{7}); so 'ΑΣΘ 𝔖 [ܐܦܩ] Du.; (*b*) as pf. Pi. of נָסָה (Ew. Di. De. and most). נשא דבר does not occur elsewhere; but it might be defended by נשא, sq. שֵׁמַע, Ex. 23^{1}; מָשָׁל, c. 27^{1} al.; חֶרְפָּה, Ps. 15^{3}; תְּפִלָּה, 2 K. 19^{4}; but the two impff. in a hypoth. sentence are against analogy; and even though we render (Du.), "Shall we take up the word to thee (address thee), thou who art disheartened?" (תלאה, a rel. cl., with אשר omitted), the constr. is forced; and נִסָּה from נָסָה yields a much better sense. The constr. will then be that of 7^{20} חטאתי מה אפעל לך, 19^{4} 21^{31b} 23^{10} בחנני כזהב אצא, in which a hyp. is expressed by a pf. followed by an impf. ἀσυνδέτως (Dr. 154; G–K. 159*h*), the ה marking it here as an interrogative. נִסָּה sq. acc. recurs in the same sense, only Qoh. 7^{23}; but (Di.) Dt. 28^{66} (הַצֵּג) is similar, and it would be easy to vocalize דַּבֵּר (so 'ΑΘ 𝔖𝔙).

תלאה] לאה is to *be wearied*, hence to *be unable to bear it*.

ועצר] G–K. 28*b*.

עצר ב׳] "withhold *with*," as 12^{15} 29^{9}; G–K. 119*q*.

מלין] from the poet. מִלָּה (Aram. Dn. 2^{5} and often): 2 S. 23^{2}, Ps. 19^{5} 139^{4}, Pr. 23^{9}; otherwise only in Job (34 times); the Aram. pl. מלין (G–K. 87*e*) 13 times; מלים 10 times. For the *position* of מי יוכל, cf. 26^{14} 38^{37} 39^{5} $41^{5.6}$, Pr. 20^{6} 24^{22} 31^{10} al. (*Lex.* 567*a*).

3. יסרת] instructed *morally*, gave moral teaching and advice to: v. supr. one of the passages in which the idea of *discipline*, properly belonging to יסר, is least prominent (cf. Ps. 16^{7}, Pr. 31^{1}). Or should עִזַּרְתָּ be read? [Perl. suggests יסדת, "strengthen, confirm"; but יסד never has this meaning.]

5. תגע עד] cf. Mic. 1^{9}, Jer. 4^{10}. The fem. (= our

"it"), of a subject not named, but before the mind of the speaker; G–K. 144*b* (cf. 122*q*, *end*).

[ותבהל] נבהל is a strong word, *be dismayed*, *thrown into alarm* (21^{6} 23^{15}, Ps. 48^{6}, Is. 21^{3} al.), much more than *troubled* (EVV).

6b. The introd. of the subj. by the ו of the pred. or apod. is very forced: rd. (Di. al.) וְתקותך תם ד'.

7. [מי הוא נקי אבד] מי הוא, as 13^{19} 17^{3}, Ps. 24^{10} (Dr. 201. 2; G–K. 136*c*): נקי *being* innocent, or *as* an innocent one, a (virtual) accus. of state, Dr. 161. 3; G–K. 118*n*.

10–11. Notice the five synonyms for "lion."

10. [שחל] 10^{16} 28^{8}, Ps. 91^{13}, Pr. 26^{13}, Hos. 5^{14} 13^{7} †. Arab. *saḥala* (among other meanings) signifies to *bray* (of an ass), so שחל may denote etymologically the *roarer*; though, as the vb. does not occur in Heb., we do not know whether the Hebrews were conscious of this meaning.

[נתעו] a clerical error for נתצו (Ps. 58^{7}): so Gr. *Not* an Aramaism (Di., Du.) for נתצו; for (1) נתע is not known in this sense in Aram., and (2) an Aram. ע corresponds to a Heb. צ only when the corresponding Arab. has ض (Dr. § 178; Wright, *Compar. Gr.*, p. 61); and no Arab. نتض is known.

11. [ליש] Is. 30^{6}, Pr. 30^{30} †. Aram. לֵיתָא [in 28^{8} 𝔗 = שחל]; Arab. *laith* (perhaps meaning *the strong one*; see Lane, 2684: cf. *lauth*, *strength*, 2678*b*).

[[יתפרדו] parallel to אבד, as in Ps. 92^{10}.]

12. [יגנב] For the fig. sense, cf. התגנב (לבוא), 2 S. 19^{4}.

[שמץ] 26^{14} †; שִׁמְצָה, Ex. 32^{25} †; Σ rightly *ψιθυρισμόν*. In later Heb. שמץ, "whisper," acquired the sense of *a little* (cf. Sir. 10^{10} 18^{32}); and this no doubt underlies the (first) rend. of 𝔊 *οὐθὲν ἄν σοι τούτων κακὸν ἀπήντησεν*: cf. 𝔗 קצת, *some*; 𝔖 ܐܢܫ ܡܢܗܘܢ]; it is also the sense adopted by the mediæval Jews (Qi. קְצָת דבר ממנו); hence AV. *a little*.

[מֶנְהוּ †] if correct, the more primitive form of מִמֶּנּוּ. Cf. מִנְּהֶם, 11^{20} †, and G–K. 103*i*, *m*.

13. [שׂעפים] Prob. also (cf. *supr.*) connected with סְעִפִּים, *branches*; cf. סֵעֲפִים (from סֵעֵף), Ps. 119^{113} *divided*, *half-hearted*.

[14. קראני] for קְרָנִי; G–K. 75*rr*].

[15. רוח] masc. as in 8^{2}; and, if the text may be trusted, in Jer. $4^{11f.}$: see Kön. iii. 248*i*].

תסמר] If 𝔐 is correct, the Pi. will be, not transitive, but *intensive* (Ew. § 120*d*, *horrescit*; G–K. 52*f*); but perhaps תְּסַמֵּר should be read (Ps. 119^{120}).

[שַׂעֲרַת] The *nomen unitatis* is impossible here, since more than a single hair must be meant; and that שערת is used exceptionally with the collective force of שֵׂעָר is improbable. 𝔐 is due to the influence of the sing. vb.; point שְׂעָרֹת (Ps. 40^{13} 69^{5}), the vb. being sing. fem. according to G–K. 145*k*. Be.^{T} proposes שְׂעָרָה, not, however, as Merx earlier, in the sense of *a whirlwind* (ct. v.^{16a}), but as a fem. with the same sense as שער in 18^{20}: he renders the whole line, *a horror caused my flesh to creep* (cf. 𝔗); but the emendation is unnecessary.]

[16. יעמד] 𝔊𝔖 Aq. render by the first person, as though it were אעמד; but there is no evidence that עמד was = קום (cf. 7^{4}) in the sense which would be required here, if the first person were correct. The words מראהו תמונה לנגד were read by 𝔊 as if אראה ותמונה ל[א] נגד; 𝔖 does not render מראהו, and treats לנגד like 𝔊. The Versions do not point to a more satisfactory text; nor is the fact that v.^{16} is at present a tristich sufficient proof that words have dropped out. Du., whose theory demands a tetrastich, suggests that the first stichos may have been intentionally abbreviated to the single word יעמד, *It stood* . . ., in order to heighten the uncanny effect; and this, perhaps, is not impossible.]

17. מן] *from* = *on the part of*, according to the judgment proceeding from (cf. מֵעִם, 34^{33}): so Nu. 32^{22} והייתם נְקִיִּם מיהוה ומישראל, Jer. 51^{5b}.

18. תהלה] If this is right, it can mean only *error* (Di.), from the Eth. *tahala*, a by-form of *taḥala*, to *wander* (Di. *Lex.* 552 f.). But a ἅπ. λεγ., explicable only from the Eth., is not very probable; and it is very likely that תהלה is miswritten for תִּפְלָה *folly* (1^{22} 24^{12}); so Hupf. Me. Sgf. Gr. EVV. *folly* is based on the Jewish deriv. from הלל (as in הֹלְלִים, Ps. 5^{6}; יהולל, c. 12^{17}): but the form תָּהֳלָה from הָלַל is impossible. De. הַתָּלָה,

deception, from חִתֵּל (13[9] 17[2]), which would be a legitimate, though rare, Aramaizing form of the Hif. inf. (G-K. 72*z*, 85*c*); but such a special sense as "deception" is not here probable. For שׂם ב׳, *to lay in* (= *attribute to*), cf. 1 S. 22[15] אל־ישם המלך בעבדו דבר.

19. ידכאום] The implicit subj. is המדכאים (6[2] 7[3] [see n.] 18[18] 19[26] etc.; G-K. 144*e*, *g*): in Engl. *they* (indef.) *crush them* = they are crushed. 𝔊𝔗 יְדַכְּאֵם; but there is no occasion to make God the subject. A passive form, such as יֻדְכְּאוּ, or (cf. 5[4]) יִדַּכְּאוּ, or ידכאון, would agree better with יֻכַּתּוּ v.[20a]. Bi.[1] restores, "cleverly but arbitrarily" (Bu.), יְדַכְּאֵם לפני [עֵת יְבַלֶּה] כבודם כמון עָשׁ.

לפני עש] *Before the moth*, *i.e.* more quickly than a moth: they have but an ephemeral existence. Others take לפני as = *in the manner of*, *like* (see on 3[24]); so already 𝔊 σητὸς τρόπον. N. Herz (*ZAW*, 1900, 160), cleverly, יִדָּכְאוּ מִלִּפְנֵי עֹשָׂם (from before their Maker).

20. יֻכַּתּוּ] See G-K. 67*y*, on the כּ. כתת is to *beat to pieces*, *beat small*, as Dt. 9[21] (of the golden calf); fig. *beat down*, *break up*, of a defeated army, as Dt. 1[44], Jer. 46[5] (גבוריהם יֻכַּתּוּ), Ps. 89[24] (וְכַתּוֹתִי מפניו צריו).

מבלי] *without* (*Lex.* 115*b*, *bottom*).

מֵשִׂים] *sc.* לב (1[8], Ex. 7[23] and often): the ellipse as 23[6] יָשִׂם בי (24[12] and 34[23] are dub.), Is. 41[20] וישימו . . . למען. A Hif. השים is, however, very dub. (Nöld. *Beiträge*, i. 37): Me. Gr. מוֹשִׁיעַ; Herz (*l.c.*), מבלי שֵׁם ("sehr beachtenswert," Nö. *l.c.*).

21. הלא נסע . . . ימותו] The constr. as v.[2], the hypoth. sentence (נסע . . . ימותו) being made interrogative by הלא here, as it is by הֲ there.

יתר] a *cord* (30[11]), of a bow (Ps. 11[2]); here a *tent-cord* (elsewhere מֵיתָר). Ols. Hi. Sgf. יְתֵדָם, *their* tent-*peg* (Hi. their *loom-peg*,—but this is more than doubtful; see Moore on Jg. 16[13. 14]): this would suit נסע (Is. 33[20]), but not בם [a dittograph of (ית)רם?—McN.], besides being a less significant figure. AV., following 𝔗𝔖 (one rend.), and Rabb., take יתר in the sense of *excellency* (i.e. *pre-eminence*), as Gn. 49[3] al.; but this does not suit either נסע, or בם, or the figure.

CHAPTER V.

2. The order (Dr. 208. 1; G–K. 142 f., *a*) shows that אויל and פתח are the emphatic words in the v.

לאויל] The ל is the *nota accus.*, common in Aram., and increasingly frequent in the later Heb.: cf. 21^{22}, Jer. 40^{2}; and see G–K. 117*n.*; *Lex.* לְ 3.

כעש] always in Job (6^{2} 10^{17} 17^{7} †) for כעס. כעס has always the meaning given above; and הכעיס always means similarly to *vex*, with Yahweh as object (as frequently in Deut. writers). For instance, it means to *vex* Him by deserting Him for other gods: see on Dt. 4^{25} $32^{16.\ 19.\ 27}$; and Hupf. on Ps. 6^{8}. It is much to be regretted that in EVV. it is always misrendered "provoke to *anger*."

3. אֲנִי רָאִיתִי] when אֲנִי has *Munaḥ* followed by *Deḥi*, it has *Ga'ja* (G–K. 16*c*) with the *sh'wa* (cf. on 3^{4}): cf. Ps. 17^{6} 116^{16}; and see Baer in Merx' *Archiv*, i. 203.

משריש] *making* (putting forth) *roots*: G–K. 53*g* [מְשֹׁרָשׁ (Be.) is unnecessary].

ואקוב] 𝔊 ἐβρώθη αὐτῶν ἡ δίαιτα (δ. for נָוֶה, 8^{6}, and often for אהל in Job, *e.g.* 8^{22}), 𝔖 ܘܣܦ, *and perished*: 'Α (κατηρασάμην) 𝔗𝔙 express 𝔐. 𝔊 *was eaten up*, suggested to Me. Bi.[1] Sgf., Be. וְרָקַב (rather, as Du. Ehrl. וַיִּרְקַב), *became rotten* (worm-eaten; cf. *NHWB* and *ChWB*, *s.v.*: Is. 40^{20} of wood; cf. Jb. 41^{19} עֵץ רִקָּבוֹן; and רָקָב, Pr. 12^{4} 𝔊 ὥσπερ ἐν ξύλῳ σκώληξ, 14^{30} σὴς δὲ ὀστέων); but the idea does not seem very probable with נָוֶה. Bu. וַיִּפָּקֵד, *was missed* (cf. ^{24}) = *was empty* (cf. 1 S. $20^{18.\ 25}$ ויפקד מקום דוד, ^{27}), rather weak; or וְרֵקָם, though admitting that the adv. is harsh. Che. (*JQR* ix. 575), with the least change from 𝔐, וַיּוּקַב, *and was cursed* (*sc.* by God); Bevan (*JPh*, 1899, p. 303) וַיִּבֹּק (Is. $24^{1.\ 3}$, Jer. 51^{2}, of a land) *and was emptied out*; Che. (*ET* x. 381) וַיִּרְקַב עָנְפוֹ פתאם, carry-

ing on the fig. of [a] (cf. Mal. 3^{19} שרש וענף). The simple וַיֵּשֶׁם (Ezk. 12^{19} 19^{7}) would perhaps be the most natural idea to expect. [McN. suggests וַיִּרְקַב נִיבוֹ.]

4. ידכאו] for יתדכאו (G–K. 54*c*); so 34^{25}.

5. אשר קצירו] 𝔊𝔖 אשר קָצְרוּ; so Me. Bi. Be. Bu. Du. Ehrl.

ואל מצנים] conventionally rendered, "and *even* out of thorns": but this sense of the prep. אל is unheard of and incredible (3^{22} is no parallel). צִנִּים recurs Pr. 22^{5} † (si vera l.) צִנִּים פַּחִים בדרך עִקֵּשׁ; cf. צִנּוֹת, fishing *hooks*, Am. 4^{2} †; and צְנִינִים, *thorns* (fig.), Jos. 23^{13}, Nu. 33^{55}. *Out of thorns* is commonly explained as meaning "from the enclosed field, protected by the thorn-hedge"; but this is very forced. Thomson (*L. and B.*, p. 348) more plausibly supposes that the reference is to the custom of farmers to lay aside the grain after threshing somewhere near the floor, "and cover it up with thorn-bushes to keep it from being carried away or eaten by animals." Robbers who found and seized this would literally "take it from among thorns." But a reference to such a special arrangement as this is not very probable. שאף—properly to *gasp* (Is. 42^{14}) or *pant* (sq. acc., for air; Jer. 14^{6}), fig. *be eager for* (Jb. 7^{2} כעבד ישאף צל), in a hostile sense (EVV. *would swallow up*), Ps. $56^{2.3}$ 57^{4}, Am. 8^{4}—is followed rightly by an accus.; and צַמִּים (sing.) recurs 18^{9} † יחזק עליו צמים; but it is a strange parallel to רָעֵב, and it agrees badly with שאף. There is clearly some corruption in each line, though no convincing emendation has hitherto been proposed. In [b] Bu. suggests with a (?), וַאֲלֻמָּתָם עני יִקָּחֶה, "and their sheaf, the poor taketh it"; Bevan (*JPh*, 1899, p. 305), וְאוֹנָם צִנִּים יִקָּחֻהוּ, "and their strength (*i.e. their wealth*: 20^{10}, Hos. 12^{9}), the barbs take it" (both retaining [c] as it stands). Du. cuts the knot by rejecting [b] as "ein Fremder Zusatz oder eine unglückliche Variante," but without explaining what it means, or how it arose. In v.[c] 'A (διψῶντες) Σ 𝔖𝔙 express צְמֵים (= צְמֵאִים) [or צמא], *the thirsty*: this forms a good ‖ to רָעֵב, and is adopted by Ew. Hirz, Me. Del.[2] al. The sg. שאף is quite defensible (G–K. 145*o*); but חילם, "their *substance*," is an unsuitable object, when the "thirsty" are the

subject; some beverage is desiderated which satisfies the thirsty as the harvest satisfies the hungry. Hence Hfm. חֲלָבָם, "their *milk*" (21[24]), for חילם; Be.—who regards [b] and [c] as doublets (?)—(for both) וְשָׁתוּ צְמֵאִים חֲלָבָם, "and the thirsty drink their milk" (Ezk. 25[4]), Ch. וְשָׁתָה צָמֵא חֲמָרָם, and Du. וְשָׁאַב צָמֵא מִבּוֹרָם, "and the thirsty draweth (cf. 𝔊 ἐκσιφωνισθείη, 𝔍 *exauriatur*, Gr. ושאבו צמאים) from their well" (Ca. 4[12] † text dub.: cf. on 8[17]),—which is no longer covered in and protected, but is open to all. The case is one of those in which 𝔐 is clearly more or less corrupt; but it is impossible to be sure what the original reading was.

7. יוּלָּד] pf. pu. in pause, with ו for *ŭ* (G–K. 9*o*). But (Di. al.) יֻלַּד is better, as a freq. sense is desiderated. Bö. Gr. Be. Bu. Du. vocalize יוֹלִד, *begetteth trouble* (ל the *nota accus.*, as v.[2]); but the change is unnecessary.

ו] The *waw adæquationis*, as frequently in proverbs in which a comparison is expressed. Usually in such cases [b] is compared to [a] (as Pr. 25[25] מים קרים על נפש עֲיֵפָה ושמועה טובה מארץ מרחק); but occasionally, as here, [a] is compared to [b] (so c. 12[11] 21[33]). See *Lex.* 253*a*.

בני רשף] רשף is a poet. word for *flame*, esp. a *pointed, darting flame*, Dt. 32[24] (see note), Ps. 76[4] (רשפי קשת, fig. for *arrows*), 78[48], Ca. 8[6] (רשפיה רשפי אש שלהבתיה) †; and בני רשף is poet. for *sparks*; cf. בן קשת, Job 41[20]; בני אשפתו, La. 3[13], fig. for *arrows* (*Lex.* 121, 6, 8). An ancient interpretation—perh. on account of עוף—took רשף to mean *birds*: so 𝔊 νεοσσοὶ δὲ γυπός, 'A καὶ υἱοὶ πτηνοῦ, Σ τὰ τέκνα τῶν πετεινῶν, 𝔖 ܒܢܝ̈ ܦܪܚܬܐ, 𝔙 avis; 𝔊'A𝔖𝔗𝔙 in Dt. 32[24]; Σ in Ps. 76[4] (Jer. volatilia arcus); 'AΣ Jer. (volucribus) in Ps. 78[48].

יגביהו עוף] lit. "make flying high": so Pr. 15[21] יְיַשֶּׁר לָכֶת, 30[29] מֵטִבֵי לָכֶת; G–K. 114*m*, *n*.

8. דברתי] דִּבְרָה elsewhere only = *manner*, Ps. 110[4], and in עַל דִּבְרַת, *on account of* . . . Qoh. 3[18] 8[2], על דברת ש' 7[14]; (Aram.) על דברת די, Dn. 2[30] 4[14] †.

9. ואין חקר] a circumst. clause; cf. ואין מספר, Ps. 104[25] 105[34], Jl. 1[6]. 𝔊 ἀνεξιχνίαστα, as 9[10] 34[24] †; cf. Ro. 11[33].

עד אין מ'] as 9[10], Ps. 40[13].

10. חוצות] חוץ is usually what is *outside* houses, *i.e.* a *street*; but sometimes it is what is *outside* a town or village, *i.e.* an *open field*: cf. 18^{17} ולא שם לו על פני חוץ, Ps. 144^{13}, Pr. 8^{26}.

11. לשום וג׳] to "make the lowly exalted" cannot possibly be a consequence of giving *rain* (v.[10]); nor is it easy to regard [11] as the consequence of [9], and [10] as parenthetical. Read הַשָּׂם with 𝔊 τὸν ποιοῦντα, 𝔙 qui ponit.

שגבו ישע] שגב is to *be exalted*, with the collat. idea of *being inaccessible*: in Qal only here and Dt. 2^{36} לא היתה קריה אשר שגבה ממנו; שִׂגֵּב, to *set on high*, often in Psalms. Cf. מִשְׂגָּב, *a high* inaccessible *retreat*. ישע = *in* safety (G–K. 117*z*).

12. תֻּשִׁיָּה] *sound counsel*. תּוּשִׁיָּה (or תֻּשִׁיָּה) is a technical term, belonging almost exclusively, and, as it seems primarily, to the "Wisdom literature." Its etymology and *exact* meaning are both uncertain. In form it is of the *tuḳtilat* type (Kö. ii. 193*b*), combining at the same time the peculiarities of תּוּגָה and תַּאֲנִיָּה. The following are its occurrences, with the renderings of the chief ancient Versions:

Jb. 5^{12} ולא תעשינה ידיהם ת׳, 𝔊 ἀληθές, 𝔖 חכמא, 𝔗 מלכת חכמתהון (the counsel of their wisdom), 𝔙 quod coeperant (paraphr.).

6^{13} הנה* אין עזרתי בי ות׳ נדחה ממני*: 𝔊 βοήθεια, 𝔖 פורקנא (*salvation, deliverance*), 𝔗 חוכמתא, 𝔙 necessarii mei (paraphr.).

11^{6} ויגד תעלמות חכמה כי כפלים [rd. כִּפְלָאִים] לת׳: 𝔊 ὅτι διπλοῦς ἔσται τῶν κατὰ σέ, 𝔖 לחכמתא, 𝔗 לחוכמתא, 𝔙 lex eius.

12^{16} עמו עז ות׳ לו שוגג ומשגה: 𝔊 ἰσχύς, Θ σωτηρία, 𝔖 חכמתא, 𝔗 חוכמתא, 𝔙 sapientia.

26^{3} מה־יעצת ללא חכמה ות׳ לָרֹב הודעת: 𝔊 τίνι ἐπακολουθήσεις, 𝔖 יולפנא (*teaching*), 𝔗 חוכמתא, 𝔙 prudentiam tuam.

30^{22} (Qrê תֻּשִׁיָּה) ותמגגני תשוה (Kt. תשוה, corrupt; rd. תְּשֻׁאָה): Θ καὶ ἀπέρριψάς με ἀπὸ σωτηρίας. 𝔊𝔖𝔗𝔙 do not recognize תשיה here at all; see note *ad loc*.

Pr. 2^{7} כי יהוה יתן חכמה מפיו דעת ותבונה: יצפן לישרים ת׳ מגן להלכי תם: 𝔊 σωτηρίαν, 𝔖 סברא (*hope*), 𝔗 בהיי (βοήθεια: Levy, *ChWB* 83*b*), 𝔙 salutem.

3^{21} נְצֹר ת' ומזמה: 𝔊 *βουλήν*, 𝔖 יולפנא, 𝔗 מדעא (*knowledge*), 𝔙 legem.

8^{14} לי עצה ות' אני בינה לי גבורה: 𝔊 *ἀσφάλεια*, 'Α *εὐνομία*, 𝔖 יולפנא, 𝔗 מילכנא (*counsel*), 𝔙 æquitas.

18^{1} בכל ת' יתגלע: 𝔊 *ἐν πάντι δὲ καιρῷ*, 𝔖 ביולפנא טבא, 𝔗 מילכנא (*counsel*), 𝔙 omni tempore.

Is. 28^{29} הִפְלִא עצה הגדיל ת': 𝔊 *ὑψώσατε ματαίαν παράκλησιν* (seemingly connected with שָׁוְא), 'Α *εὐνομίαν*, Σ *σωτηρίαν*, Θ *ἰσχύν*, 𝔖 תרביתא (*increase* of disciples: PS. 3793), 𝔗 who made great the works of creation by the greatness of his *wisdom* (חכמתיה), 𝔙 iustitiam.

Mic. 6^{9} ות' יִרְאֶה שמך: 𝔊 *καὶ σώσει φοβουμένους* (יִרְאֵי) *τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ*, 𝔖 יולפנא לדחלי שמה, 𝔗 Hark! Yahweh's prophets cry out to the city, *and teach* (ומלפיא) them that fear thy name, 𝔙 et *salus* erit timentibus nomen tuum.

תושיה is thus most frequently associated, or parallel, with wisdom, or (26^{3}, Pr. 8^{14}, Is. 28^{29}) counsel, sometimes also with help (6^{13}) or strength (12^{16}, cf. Pr. 8^{14}); but it also suggests the practical *effects* of wisdom or counsel (hence the renderings *βοήθεια*, *σωτηρία*, which need not presuppose תְּשׁוּעָה for תֻּשִׁיָּה, פורקנא). The etym. is uncertain.

K. J. Grimm (*Journ. Am. Or. Soc.*, 1901, i. 35 ff.), following Haupt (*ib.* p. 36), derives תושיה from the √ of Ass. *issu*, *usâtu*, *prop*, *support*; *asitu*, *pillar* (= Talm. Mand. אשיתא; cf. אָשְׁיוֹתֶיהָ, Jer. 50^{15} Qrê, and *Lex.* 1121*a*), *âsû*, *physician* (prop. *helper*; hence Aram. אָסָא, ܐܣܐ, to *heal*; and supposes that its original meaning was *prop*, *support*, which he thinks is still retained in Jb. 30^{22} (reading with Θ Du. מתשיה, *without support*: see *ad loc.*), and that it afterwards acquired the senses of *help* (12^{16}, Is. 28^{29}), *success* (5^{12}), *power* (Pr. 8^{14} 18^{1}), *reliability* (11^{6} 26^{3}, Pr. 3^{21}): in Mic. 6^{9} he reads with 𝔊 יוֹשִׁיעַ יְרֵאֵי שמך. But such a variety of meanings, many within the limits of a single book, is not probable. A survey of its occurrences suggests the conclusion that תושיה, while a synonym of *wisdom* and *counsel*, suggests something more than either of these words; and that the nearest English equivalent for it would be *effective counsel* or *effective wisdom*. If the

√ idea is really *support*, we must suppose that it was applied specially to a *supporting* or *helping* quality of mind.

14. כלילה] = "as *in* the night," a prep. being used after כ only in certain very exceptional cases: see G-K. 118*s*, *u*.

ימששו] without dag. G-K. 20*m*.

15. The two clauses are so unevenly balanced that there must be an error somewhere. Ew. מָחֳרָב, *him that has been desolated*; but this verb is used only of places and cities, never of a person. The least change would be to read, with some 20 MSS, 𝔖𝔗𝔙, פיהם for מפיהם, *from the sword of their mouth* (fig. for slander, false accusation, etc.; cf. Ps. 57[5] ולשונם חרב חדה, 59[8] חרבות בשפתותיהם, 64[4]): but to produce a balanced parallelism a syn. of אביון is required. The best suggestion is Bu.'s מַחֲרִבָּם יָתֹם (for the יָתֹם see 24[9] 29[12]), or (which he himself prefers) מפיהם יָתֹם (the three letters יתם having dropped out of the group מפיהמיתמומיד, and then מחרב supplied for the missing word in the wrong place). Ehrl. מחרב פִּיפִיּוֹת (Ps. 149[6]).

16. עֹלָתָה (*mil'el*)] The old accus., found (in the *fem.*) about 14 times in Heb., as a poet. form (without any consciousness of its orig. grammatical force): G-K. 90*g* [עוֹלָתָה is for עַוְלָתָה: cf. Ps. 92[16] Kt., and the plu. עוֹלוֹת, Ps. 58[3] 64[7]].

18. . . . כי הוא] The pron. emphatic in the causal clause: 11[11] 28[24], Gn. 3[20] al. (1 S. 14[18]; *Lex*. 215*a*).

יכאיב] For כָּאַב, of the pain, or soreness, from a wound, cf. Gn. 34[25].

יִתְבָּשׁ] in pause from יָחֲבֹשׁ (G-K. 63*d*).

תרפינה] from רפה=רפא: G-K. 75*qq*.

19. בשש] 𝔊 ἑξάκις ἐξ ἀναγκῶν, "*from* six . . ." This *may* point to a reading מִשֵּׁשׁ (Be. Du.); but the change is not necessary: ב' followed by ב' in [b] is an effective repetition; and 𝔊 may have merely rendered freely.

20. פדך] The pf. of certitude (Dr. 14γ; G-K. 106*m*).

21. בשוט] 1 MS 𝔊𝔖𝔙, מִשּׁוֹט, "*From* the scourge," etc. A necessary correction. Confusion of ב and מ is common: 𝔊 often expresses one (not always rightly) where MT. has the other. There was a stage in the history of the Heb. script in

which the two letters closely resembled each other (*Notes on Samuel*[2], p. lxvii). To explain בְּשׁוֹם as = בִּהְיוֹת שׁוֹם is forced.

22. כפן] 30[3] †. Aram. for Heb. רעב (*e.g.* Gn. 12[10] 𝔗).

23. השדה] האדמה (Du.) [or הארץ with 2 MSS [Ken.]] would be more elegant before השדה in [b] [cf. 8[3] n.].

השלמה †] pass. of השלים, *make peaceful*, Pr. 16[7]. Gr. שְׁלֵמָה (22[21]).

24. שלום *is peace*: a subst., where we should use an adj.; so Gn. 43[27] הֲשָׁלוֹם אביך, c. 21[9] בתיהם שלום מפחד, and frequently; also with other words. See Dr. 186–9, esp. 189. 2; G–K. 141*c*.

ולא תחטא] חטא has here its primary physical meaning of *miss*, which it has also in Jg. 20[16] כל זה קֹלֵעַ אל השערה ולא יחטיא, "and would not *cause* it *to miss*"; Pr. 8[36] חֹטְאִי חֹמֵס נפשו, "he that *misseth* me injureth his own soul"; 19[2] אץ ברגלים חוטא, 20[2] (חוטא נפשו = *forfeits* his own soul (life): so Hab. 2[10]). The √ has the same meaning in Arabic (conj. ii. and iv.); in Eth. it means to *fail to find* or *to have*, to *be without* (as Ja. 1[4. 5]). חטא, to *sin* (like ἁμαρτάνειν) is thus properly to *miss* the right mark.

25. צאצאיך] 21[8] 27[14] 31[8], Is. 22[24] 44[3] 48[19] 61[9] 65[23]; of the product of the earth, Is. 34[1] 42[5] †.

26. בכלח] 30[2] עלימו אבד כלח †. An enigmatic word. The √ is known otherwise only in Arab., in which *kalaḥa* is to *contract* the face, to look *hard and stern* (Lane, 2628); in conj. iii. to show oneself *hard and firm* against another; *kulaḥ* also is a *hard* year (from dearth or famine); and *dahr*[un] *kāliḥ*[un] is a *hard*, distressing time. These data suggest the meaning *firm strength*, *vigour* (with unimpaired powers, without any long and weakening illness: cf. for the thought, 21[23f.]), which would also suit 30[2]. And if the text is correct, this, or something like this, is, with our present knowledge, the only meaning that we can give it. The Vrss. merely guess: 𝔊 om. ([a] ὥσπερ κτλ. being really a doublet of [b]: v. Be.); 𝔖 ܒܫܝܢܐܝܬ; 𝔗 בשלימות שניך (connecting doubtless with √ כָּלָה); 𝔙 in abundantia; in 30[2] 𝔊 om.; Θ συντέλεια

(כָּלָה); 𝕾 ܟܠܗ ܒܣܘܪܢܐ (as if כָּל־לֵחַ ?); 𝕿 בְּקִיר, *grave* (*v.* Levy); 'Α παντελές; Σ πᾶν τὸ πρὸς ζωήν; 𝕵 omnis vita. The Rabb. are evidently influenced by √ כלה: Ra. גְּמַר בִּישּׁוּל התבואה כשבישלה כל צורכה; IE במלאת מספר ימיו והיא הזקנה; Qi. עת זקנה; hence EVV. *a full age* (30^2 RV. *ripe age*, but RVm. *vigour*). Di. (*volle Reife*) attempts to place the connexion with √ כָּלָה on a philological basis, by assuming כלח to be a harder form of כָּלָה, *Vollendung*: but כלה is "Vollendung" in the sense of *complete destruction*; and the entire explanation from √ כלה is most precarious. Be.[K] בְּחֵילְךָ (cf. 21^7); Me. בְּלֵחַ; Che. (*JQR* ix. 576) better בְּלֵחֲךָ (Dt. 34^7).

27. חֲקַרְנוּהָ כֶּן־הִיא] The dag. in כֶּן is not acc. to rule, the tone on כֶּן־הִיא not being on the first syll. (Qi. *Michlol* (ed. Lyck), 80*b*, l. 10–14; Baer, *Prov.* p. xiii f. (§ 7), in his Rules of Daghesh; cf. Kö. i. 63.)

[שמענה] 𝔐 שְׁמָעֶנָּה, *hear* (*thou*) *it*; but the emphatic pronoun suggests that the change of person from the 1st per. pl. of line *a* takes place not in the first, but in the second, clause of line *b*. Point, therefore, with 𝔊𝕾 שְׁמַעֲנֻהָ.]

CHAPTER VI.

2. שקול ישקל] emphasizing the idea of *weighed*. For this inf. Qal beside the Nif., see G-K. 113*w*. 𝔊 εἰ γάρ τις ἱστῶν στῆσαι = לו שָׁקֹל ישקל (G-K. 144*e*).

הַיָּתִי] Qrê הַוָּתִי, as everywhere else in Kt. (30^{13} in the sing.; 6^{30} and elsewhere in the pl.). The √ *hawā'* in Arab. means to *gape* (of a wound or the mouth); *huwwatun* is a *yawning deep*, *chasm*, *abyss*; so Syr. ܗܘܬܐ (*e.g.* Lk. 16^{26} for χάσμα): hence הַוָּה would seem to mean properly a *yawning gulf*; fig. *engulfing ruin*, *destruction*, or *calamity*. So (with various *nuances*) v.[30] 30^{13}, Ps. 5^{10} 38^{13} $52^{4.9}$ (but rd. here הונו) 55^{12} 57^{2} 91^{3} 94^{20}, Pr. 17^{4} 19^{13}.

ישאו] *sc.* הַנֹּשְׂאִים; as explained on 4^{19} = *are lifted up, laid.* [But 𝔊 ἆραι may point to a reading ישא (to be construed according to G-K. 144*d*), which is, perhaps, metrically preferable.]

3. כי עתה] "for then" (= in that case), as 3^{13} 13^{19}, Nu. 22^{29}.

לָעוּ (*mil'el*)] This would come naturally only from לוע, to *swallow up*, which yields no sense: لغا, however, means to *speak rashly* (cf. *laghwun*, *rashness* in an oath, Qor. 2^{225}, *rash*, or *empty word*, 52^{23}; 23^{3} = βαττολογία in prayer), and this yields a suitable sense: though לָעוּ *might*, very exceptionally (Ew. 92*e*; G-K. 75*m*), come from לָעָה, it is better to change the place of the tone and read לָעוּ.

4. עמדי] see, on the idiomatic use, on 9^{35}. Or perhaps (Du.) *with me* is used in a physical sense, the fig. being that of arrows with their points lodged in his flesh, and the shafts protruding *around* him, hence "with": cf. 𝔊 ἐν τῷ σώματί μου. In any case, "*within me*" (EV.) is incorrect.

יערכוני] From ערך, *set in order, array* (*sc.* מלחמה), with מלחמה omitted, as Jg. $20^{30.\ 33}$, 1 S. 4^{2}, and the sf. poetically in the accus. (for עלי or לקראתי); G–K. 117*x*; Kö. iii. § 22. So 𝕿 יסדרון לקבלי, 𝖀 *militant contra me*; the same reading is also presupposed by 𝕾 סרדתני (l. סדרתני). 𝕲 κεντοῦσί με (𝕴 stimulant me) = ? יערקוני ($30^{3.\ 17}$†), *gnaw me*; so Me. Sgf. Still the ellipse, with the accus. sf. ־ני, is certainly harsh; and Di. ("possibly"), Wr. Bu. Ch. (*JQR* ix. 574), Be. Du. St. יַעְכְּרוּנִי, *undo me*, may well be right. עכר (Jos. 6^{18} 7^{25}, Jg. 11^{35}, 1 K. $18^{17.\ 18}$ al.) is a strong word (Moore on Judg. *l.c.*), much more than "trouble" (EVV.), to *make turbid* (Arab. *ʿakira, to be turbid*), fig. for *destroy the happiness of, undo.*

5. נהק] 30^{7} † [also in Ar. and Jewish Aram.].

[געה] 1 S. 6^{12} †; also in Aram.]

עֲלֵי] Poet. for על: 15 times in Job, and about 25 times elsewhere (*Lex.* 752*b*).

בלילו] 24^{6}, Is. 30^{24} †. Syr. ܒܠܝܠ in the same sense (PS. 535).

6. תפל] *what is tasteless, insipid*: cf. on תִּפְלָה, 1^{22}.

מבלי] see on 4^{20}.

בריר חלמות] *in the slime* (1 S. 21^{14} of saliva) *of purslain*; 𝕾 ܚܠܡܘܬܐ (PS. 1284), *purslain*; called in Ar. *ḥamqā*, the *foolish* plant, "because exuding mucilage, so that it is likened to the *ʾaḥmaq* (idiot), whose saliva is flowing" (Lane, *Arab. Lex.* 646*b*; cf. Ges. *Thes.* 480). 𝕿¹ בחלבון ביעתא וחלמונא, 𝕿² בּרירא במרי לחמא, 𝕿ᴸ בּרירא דחלמונא. According to the Rabbis הלבון (or חלבון) is the *white* of an egg, and חלמון (or חלמון) the *yolk* (see Ges. *Thes.* 480; Levy, *s.v.* חלמון); and so they explain חַלָּמוּת as meaning the *yolk*, and ריר חלמות as the *slime of the yolk, i.e.* the *white* (hence EVV. "the white of an egg"). But this is very artificial and improbable. 𝕲 ἐν ῥήμασιν κενοῖς = בדברי חֲלֹמוֹת, "in words of dreams": so Klo., improbably. Ch. (*EB* iii. 3984) for the whole verse would read, cleverly but needlessly, הַאֹכַל פִּתִּי בַּעֲלֵי מַלֻּחַ אִם אֶשְׁתֶּה מְרַק חַלָּמוּת, "shall I eat my morsel with leaves of mallow, or drink broth of purslain?"

7a. לִנְגֹּעַ] [G–K. 66*b*;] 𝔊 *παύσασθαι*, *i.e.* (Du.) לְרַגִּיעַ or לְרַגַּע (G–K. 53*q*, 51*l*), which Du. adopts, placing the hemistich after 4^c.

7b. As the text stands, "They (*i.e.* such sufferings as these) are like sickness (*st. c.* of דְּוַי; Ps. 41^4 עֶרֶשׂ דְּוָי; cf. דַּי from דַּי) of my food"; *i.e.* they are loathsome to me as if my food were diseased. But המה has no proper antecedent, and the whole sentence is expressed unnaturally. Bu., plausibly, adopting זִהֲמָה (from Wr. (cf. 𝔊 *βρῶμον*, which points to the same consonants), and reading דוי for כדוי: "It *loathes* the sickness of my food (my diseased food)," fig. for the sufferings, which, like repulsive food, Job has to accept at God's hands. Aram. זְהִים is to *be foul*, Pa., in Syriac, to *make foul*; in Heb., c. 33^{20} (see note), to *declare*, *treat as* (G–K. 52*g*), *find*, *foul* = to *loathe*. [McN. suggests זִהֵם חִכִּי לַחְמִי.] 𝔊 has *βρόμον* (rd. with 3 MSS *βρῶμον*) *γὰρ ὁρῶ τὰ σῖτά μου ὥσπερ ὀσμὴν λέοντος*, whence Me. פְּרֵיחַ שַׁחַל, and Be. (פְּרֵיחַ לְבִי(א)), *like the odour of a lion*, with allusion to the offensive odour of the lion, or (Be.) of the lion's flesh, which was noticed by the ancients (Bochart, *Hieroz.* i. 744). But the comparison cannot be said to be probable. Du., who (*v. supr.*) puts 7^a after 4^c, would read for 7^b חֲמוֹ כַּדוּ חֶלְמוֹן, which he supposes to be an Aram. gloss on 6^b חלמות, "that means now the yolk of an egg," which was made by the translators of 𝔊 into המה כְּרֵיחַ לָבִיא. Clever, but precarious and improbable.

8. תבוא] So 13^6 14^{18}. 𝔊𝔖𝔗𝔙 ותבוא, as 19^{23}. On the construction of מי יתן, *v.* further, G–K. 151*b*, *d*; *Lex.* 678*b*, f.

ותקותי] 𝔊 Hu. Me. Du. וְתַאֲוָתִי: *v. supr.*

9. ויֹאֵל] *be willing*, *consent*: *v.* Moore, *Judges*, p. 47; *Lex.* 384*a*.

וידכאני] G–K. 120*d*.

יַתֵּר] *i.e.* give his hand full play. Elsewhere of *loosening* the thongs of a yoke, Is. 58^6, and *setting free* prisoners, Ps. 105^{20} 146^7.

10. עוד] 3 MSS 𝔗𝔙 Saad. read זאת for עוד (so Du.; Bu. thinks possible); but it may be due to a reminiscence of Ps. 119^{50}.

נֶחָמָתִי] so Ps. 119^{50}, from נֶחָמָה (for נַחֲמָה: G–K. 22*c*;

also *27q*, *29v*; cf. בֶּהָלָה, נֶאָצָה, Neh. 9[18]), of the same type as בַּקָּשָׁה, בַּקָּרָה, קַלָּסָה, and with the *qāmeṣ* retained, even when the tone is carried forward by a sf., as בַּקָּשָׁתִי, Est. 5[7] al.; עַוָּתָתִי, La. 3[59], cf. in *st. c.* בַּקָּרַת, Ezk. 34[12]; פָּרָשַׁת, Est. 4[7] (G–K. 84*b*[a]; more fully, Ols. § 183*b*; Kö. ii. 179 f.).

אסלדה †] A very uncertain word. 𝕲 *εἴη δέ μου πόλις* (עיר) *τάφος, ἐφ' ἧς ἐπὶ τειχέων* (חֵל) *ἡλλόμην ἐπ' αὐτῆς· οὐ φείσομαι* (אחמל); 𝕾 ܘܐܫܬܡܠܐ ܚܣܝܢܐ (shall be perfected in strength!); 𝕿 אבוע (would *rejoice*, *exult*; elsewhere for גיל, Zec. 9[9]; רנן, Ps. 51[16]; עלז, Hab. 3[18], Ps. 60[8] 149[5]); 𝖁 ut *affligens* me dolore non parcat. *Exult* would suit the context; and two methods have been adopted for extracting this meaning from 𝕸. (1) It has been derived from صلد, "hart sein, hart auftreten, *pedibus pulsavit terram equus*" (Schultens *ap.* Ges., De. Di. Bu. Du.). But this etym. is extremely questionable: for (1) ס does not correspond to Arab. ص; and (2) the sense *pulsavit terram* is derived and secondary, as Lane (1716) shows: the √ means to be *hard and smooth*, as of land producing no herbage, *hard* in the sense of niggardly, also (among various other meanings), of a beast, to *beat* the ground with its forefeet in running: and the adj. *ṣald* is *hard and smooth*, of a stone, the ground, a hoof, etc., and *hardy*, *strong*, *enduring*, of a horse or camel. A word with these senses is not at all likely to have come to denote *to spring*, *leap*, or *exult*. (2) It has been connected with NH. סלד, which means to *draw back* (intrans. = נמשך לאחוריו), as *Shabb.* 40*b*, of the hand *drawing back* from the heat of the fire, Maksh. 5[9], of a viscid liquid (see Surenh. *Mishna*, *ad loc.*: vi. 443). Levy, in *NHWB*, iii. 531, is influenced, partly by the *assumed* meaning of סָלֵד here, and partly by the Arab. *ṣalada*, to which (going far beyond either Freytag or Lane) he attributes the sense *in die Höhe steigen*, *springen* (see Fleischer's correction, *ib.* 724*a*), so as to give סלד the root-meaning of *spring up* or *leap*; but this is not at all implied in the passage quoted, and in other respects rests upon most inconclusive grounds. The case is one of those in which conjectural emendation is wiser than "conjectural translation" (see on this Gray, *Isaiah*, i. p. x, with the references); and ואעלזה, or (as Jb. 20[18] 39[13])

ואעלסה, *I would exult* (cf. 𝕿, above), is not a too violent emendation of אסלדה to be reasonably adopted (so, as I afterwards discovered, Gr.).

בחילה לא יחמל] 26 MSS, 𝕿, Be. ולא יחמל: so 16[13] 27[22], but after another vb. with the same subject. חילה (the prepositive *tifḥa* not marking the tone) may be either *mil'el*, and so = חִיל by G–K. 90*f*, "in the anguish that spareth not" (Hi.; so Du., but reading the normal חִיל), or *milra'*, a *fem.* form of חיל (not elsewhere), "in anguish, (wherein) he spareth not" (Ew. § 331*c*, Di. De. Bu.). Either constr. is possible; the former is simpler, notwithstanding (De.) that יחמל has always elsewhere a *personal* subject.

12. נחוש] an adj., only here. *Vid.* the next note.

13. האם] Elsewhere only Nu. 17[28] הַאִם תַּמְנוּ לִגְוֹעַ, *i.e.* apparently, "Shall we ever have finished dying?" (Dr. 19. 2; *Lex.* 50*b*). אם in a question is *Num?* and always expects the answer *No*: EVV. *Is it not . . .?* which the sense requires, is consequently an impossible rendering. The text must thus be at fault. 𝕾 ܗܐ ܠܐ, 𝖁 Ecce, non est . . ., which point to הנה אין (Be.; Bu. alt.): Du., merely dividing the words differently הֵא מֵאַיִן, *Behold* (Gn. 47[23], Ezk. 16[43] † common in Aram., as הָא), *of nought* (Is. 41[24]) *is my help within me*; but the rarity of הֵא in Heb. renders this uncertain. Gr., very plausibly, for האם: נחוש, גם: נחושה (נחושה being a *subst.*, 28[2] al., and G–K. 141*d*). Hi. Bu. (text) take אם as *if*, assuming an aposiopesis: "Am (I to wait), if . . .?" *i.e.* "What, if" (or "Even if," Bu.) "my help is not in me," etc. But this is forced.

עזרתי] Be. Bu. עֶזְרָתָה (Ps. 44[27]; G–K. 90*g*).

תושיה] *Vid.* on 5[12]. 𝕲 σωτηρία, 𝕾 ܦܘܪܩܢܐ; but, though תשועה would be suitable, it is doubtful if these renderings presuppose it (*v.* p. 31).

14. Hard and uncertain. מָס † adj. from מסס, of the same form as תָּם (Stade, § 193*b*, 3), lit. *one melting away*, *i.e.* failing, collapsing, despairing; cf. the √ in Nif. נָמַס, often of the heart, to *give way*, *lose courage*: perhaps indeed (Bu.) לְנָמֵס should be read. 𝕸 would naturally mean: "Kindness belongeth (is

due) to him that is in despair, and that forsaketh the fear of the Almighty" (יעזב . . . ו continuing לַמָּס; cf. Is. 5^{23} 46^{6} etc.: G–K. 116*x*; Dr. 117); but Job would then be ascribing to himself failing faith too distinctly: *even though he forsook* (Di. Bu.) is not what 𝔐 expresses, as Bu. virtually admits, when he says that גם (for גם כי), or והוא, for וְ would be more distinct: and *else might he* (RVm.) gives וְ an impossible sense. 𝔖𝔙 for לַמָּס have ܠܡܟܠܐ, Qui tollit (= מֹנֵעַ; Be. הַמֵּסִיר, *He that removeth* (מֵסִיר, trans., as Zec. 3^{9}),—palæographically easier, but not expressing the right idea), and יראת for ויראת (𝔗 also has דמנע for למס), *i.e.* "He that withholdeth kindness from his friend, forsaketh the fear of the Almighty"; Du. gets the same general sense, but by a less satisfactory way. Hi. De. understand חסר in its Aram. sense of *shame, reproach* (Lv. 20^{17}, Pr. 14^{34} †; חִסֵּד Pr. 25^{10} †): "If reproach come to one in despair from his friend, he will forsake the fear of the Almighty": but the hypoth. sense (without a verb in the first clause) is very doubtfully expressed (see the types without a hypoth. particle, in Dr. 148, 152–155); and the thought of what Job would do in such a case leads on to nothing in the sequel. Ew. conjectured that two lines had dropped out: "Kindness is (due) from his friend to him that is in despair [and compassion from his brother to him that is afflicted of God; that he succumb not to the pain of his heart,] and forsake the fear of the Almighty." This yields an excellent sense: those who think it too bold must, in view of the difficulties attaching to 𝔐, acquiesce in the reading of 𝔖𝔙.

15. כאפיק נחלים יעברו] Du. כאפיקים, omitting נחלים as an error due to נחל in ª, and as not in 𝔊. But 𝔊 has (after בגדו) *ὥσπερ χειμάρρους ἐκλείπων* (אָפֵס for כאפק, Be.; Is. 29^{20} 𝔊), *ἢ ὥσπερ κῦμα* (*'Α 𝔖 κύματα* = כְּגַלִּים, Be.) *παρῆλθόν με*, and found therefore letters representing נחלים. Bu. conj. כַּאֲפִיקֵי מַיִם (Ps. 42^{2}, Jl. 1^{20}, Ca. 5^{12}), which reads well, but is not necessary [though such a repetition of the same term in parallel lines as occurs in 𝔐 is open to some suspicion: see Gray, *Forms of Hebrew Poetry*, pp. 255 n. and 295].

יעברו] *pass away* (as 11^{16} 30^{15}), Hrz. De. Da. Hi. Bu.;

overflow (as Is. 8[7]), Di. Du.; the former is the better parallel to [a].

16. מִנִּי] poet. for מִן: 19 times in Job and 13 times elsewhere (+ מִנֵּי, Is. 30[11. 11] †).

17. בְּעֵת] *st. c.*, before the foll. rel. clause (G–K. 130*d*, 155*l*: cf. Dt. 32[35]).

יְזֹרְבוּ] Pu. from זרב, apparently a by-form of צָרַב, Ezk. 21[3] † (צָרָב, Pr. 16[27] †; צָרֶבֶת, Lv. 13[23. 28] †): cf. צעק and זעק, עלץ and עלז. RVm. *shrink* connects it with Syr. ܙܪܒ, to *press close*, *compress*, *compressit*; *coarctavit*, so some older scholars, as J. D. Mich., Eichhorn, Umbreit, Friedr. Delitzsch, *Prolegg.* 36 f., and in his transl. (1902) ("bedrängt").

בְּחֻמּוֹ] "when it is hot," as אוֹר, "it becomes light," 1 S 29[10]; וְלֹא יִחַם לוֹ, 1 K. 1[1] (G–K. 144*c*, cf. *b*); but there is no other case of the "it" being represented by an explicit pron., and Bu. may be right in condemning it as a "Germanism," and in reading בְּחֹם וְנִדְעֲכוּ (constr. as Gn. 31[8], Ex. 1[10], of reiteration in past or present time, and often of an occurrence in the future, as Gn. 3[5], Ex. 16[6]; Dr. 123β; G–K. 112*oo*). Be. in v[a] וְנִצְמְתוּ (Is. 35[7] 49[10] †) בְּעֵת שָׁרָב.

נִצְמְתוּ] the *Nif.*, as 23[17] †. The verb is poet. for *bring to an end*, *cut off completely*, *e.g.* Ps. 18[41] וּמְשַׂנְאַי אַצְמִיתֵם, 101[5. 8]. Cf. צְמִיתֻת, Lv. 25[23. 30] †, of the *complete cutting off* (permanent alienation) of land.

18. יִלָּפְתוּ אָרְחוֹת דַּרְכָּם] לפת (Jg. 16[29] (to *wring round*), Ru. 3[8] †) = Arab. *lafata*, to *twist* or *wring*, to *turn aside*, or *divert*, from anything (Lane, 2665); hence 𝔐 the paths of their (the wadys') way *twist*, or *wind themselves about* (so De. Da. Hi. Bu.). Ew. Ol. Di. Sgf. Du. אֹרְחוֹת דרכם (or יְלַפְּתוּ) יִלָּפְתוּ, *caravans* (אֹרְחָה, a *travelling* company, v.[19] (rd. אֹרְחוֹת), Gn. 37[25], Is. 21[13] †: the fem. by G–K. 122*s*) *twist aside*, *divert*, their course.

יַעֲלוּ בַתֹּהוּ] for עלה in the sense of *go up and disappear*, cf. Ex. 16[14] (of *dew*), Is. 5[24] וּפִרְחָם כָּאָבָק יַעֲלֶה, Ps. 102[25] (Hif.) אַל־תַּעֲלֵנִי.

19. אָרְחוֹת] rd. אֹרְחוֹת; see on v.[18].

הֲלִיכוֹת] elsewhere = *going(s)*: Ps. 68[25], Pr. 31[27], Nah. 2[6], Hab. 3[6] †.

קִוּוּ לָמוֹ] either *waited for them* (3^9: so Di. Du. Bu.); or *waited fondly* (Ew. Schl. Hi. De. in note), ל being the reflexive ל (as 12^{11} etc.: *Lex.* 516*a*; G–K. 119*s*) indicating how they *satisfied themselves* with the hope, *fed themselves* upon it. Hi. "Der Dativ wirft die Handlung auf das Subj. zurück, ausdrückend, dass sie mit dieser Hoffnung sich selbst hinhalten."

20. בָּטַח] rd. בטחו: there are many such cases of a ו being accidentally omitted, or added, by error: cf. on 1 S. 9^4 12^5 13^{19} 15^{16}; G–K. 145*u*.

עָדֶיהָ] the fem. sf., if correct, will refer to נחלים construed collectively as a fem. (G–K. 135*p*, cf. 145*k*): but this is hardly natural; and prob. עדיהם should be read.

21. כִּי עַתָּה הֱיִיתֶם לוֹ] לוֹ is the Western reading; the Or. reading is לֹא with Qrê לוֹ (Baer, 37, 56): 𝕿 הֲוֵיתוּן כְּלָא, Saad. follow Or.; 𝕲𝕾 express לִי. (*a*) לוֹ can only be rendered "now are ye become *that*" (viz. a deceptive נחל); but this is forced and improbable; Gr. expresses this sense better by the conjecture דְּמִיתֶם לָמוֹ, *are ye like* (Is. 1^9 al.) *unto them?* (*b*) לֹא is adopted by Schl. De. Hi. "now are ye become *nothing*": cf. כְּלָה חשיבין (= כְּלָא), Dn. 4^{32} (where, however, it is better to construe "are as *men not accounted of*": *v.* Bevan), and לְאַל, c. 24^{25}. But this meaning for לֹא is against all analogy: 1 K. 3^{21}, Is. 15^6, Jer. 5^{12}, Ezk. $21^{32.18}$, Pr. 19^7, cited by De., do not support it; nor does Kön. ii. 236 f. succeed in showing it to be probable. And 𝕿 is not (as often quoted) הויתון כלא (as though כלא were = "as *nothing*"), but ארום כדון הויתון כלא הויתון, "Ye are now become, *as if you had not been*" (cf. Ob. [16] והיו כלוא היו). This sense would be properly expressed by (*c*) לְאַיִן (cf. Is. 40^{17} כְּאַיִן נגדו, [23] הנותן רזנים לאין); so Bö. Di., though לִי לאין would be more pointed. It is best (*d*), adopting לי from 𝕲𝕾, and כֵּן for כי from Houb. and J. D. Mich., to read with Ew. Ol. Bu. Pe. "*So* are ye now become *unto me*": you are as useless to me now as the dried up wady is to those who expected refreshment from it.

תִּרְאוּ] Some MSS and edd., including even Baer (p. 37), תִּירְאוּ, *ye fear*—a scribal error (De.), producing an intolerable tautology with וַתִּירָאוּ.

חֲתַת †] elsewhere we have חַת (41[25]), חִתָּה (Gn. 35[5]), and חִתִּית (Ezk. †).

22. הֲכִי] Is it that . . .? כי adds force and distinctness to the question which follows: so 2 S. 9[1], Gn. 27[36] 29[15] †. Cf. אך כי, הֲלֹא כי, אמנם כי, etc.: *v. Lex.* 472*a*.

כַּחֲכָם] as Pr. 5[10]. חַיִל is more common in this application.

שְׁחָדוּ] G–K. 64*a*.

24. לִי] הבין, sq. ל, as Dn. 8[16], הָבֵן לְהַלָּז את המראה; absol. Dn. 11[33], 2 Ch. 35[3]. Cf. on 5[2].

25. נמרצו] The √ מרץ occurs in Heb. only here, 16[3] או מה ימריצך כי תענה, 1 K. 2[8] קללה נִמְרֶצֶת, Mic. 2[10] חבל נמרץ. So far as the letters go, it might be connected with either (1) مَرَصَ, to *press with the fingers* (Freyt.), or (2) مَرِضَ, to *be sick* (= Aram. מְרַע, ܡܪܥ). From (1) no sense suitable here can be obtained. The sense *made sick* = *severe*, would suit 1 K. 2[8], Mic. 2[10] (cf. מַכָּה נַחְלָה, a stroke *made sick* = *severe*); but *severe* would be entirely out of place here. EVV. "forcible" (De. Bu. *eindringlich*) is derived from I.E. חָזְקוּ, Qi. (Book of Roots, *s.v.*) עִנְיָנָם עִנְיַן חוֹזֶק וְתוֹקֶף: the meaning *strong* (חָזָק, חֲזָקָה) suits (superficially), 1 K. 2[8] (AVm. "Heb. *strong*"), Mic. 2[10], and therefore it suits this verse; "strong" words are, of course, "forcible" words (see another instance of the same Rabb. method of argument on 28[18]). But "strong" has no philol. basis; and De. explains "eindringlich" only by very questionable etym. combinations and assumptions. Ges. *Thes.* "*acria*, *i.e.* valida victricia verba"; but this rests on the assumption of Cocceius and Simonis that מרץ (properly *acer fuit*, and then *vehemens fuit*) is a metathesis of مضر, to *be sour*, *acid*; Di.'s *gereizt* (irritated, provoked, stirred up) is a meaning both doubtful and unsuitable; and "irritating" (Peake) is in addition inconsistent with the Nif. form. No sense agreeable to the context can thus be extracted from the √ מרץ. Recourse must therefore be had to emendation; and נמלצו, "How *smooth* (pleasant) . . ." (Ps. 119[103]), may be safely adopted (cf. 𝔗 בְּסִימִין). So, only attaching this sense to נמרצו, Rashi, Schult. Ew. (a harder pronunciation for

נמלצו), Hrz. Schl.; but it is better to *read* נמלצו (so Gr. Du. Che.).

26. להוכח] G-K. 65*f*, 69*v*.

[לרוח] To obtain parallelism Be.[T] suggests substituting for לרוח an inf. parallel to להוכיח in v.[26a]—לְיַסֵּר or לְרַדֵּף (cf. Pr. 19[7]) rather than לְדַיֵּח (=להדיח). McN. suggests לריב (followed by acc. of obj. as in 10[2], Is. 27[8]).]

27a. תפילו] הפיל for גּוֹרָל הפיל has the support of 1 S. 14[42]; but 𝔊 ἐπιπίπτετε, 𝔙 irruitis, Saad.; and so Bi. Be. Du. תִּפְּלוּ, "Will ye even *fall upon* the fatherless?" Bi. Gr. Du. would further read על תם (or עֲלֵי תם) for על יתום, "Will ye even fall upon the *blameless one* (*i.e.* myself: 1[1])?" but על יתום implies the more caustic reproach.

27b. תכרו על] כּרה is to *buy* (Dt. 2[6], Hos. 3[2]); to *buy over* may be thought a singular expression for *make a bargain over*, *make merchandise of*; but it is supported by 40[30] יכרו עליו חַבָּרִים יחצוהו בין כנענים. 𝔊 ἐνάλλεσθε, whence Me. Bi.[2] Be., following Schult., תָּכֹרוּ from כָּרַר = Arab. *karra*, of a warrior, to *turn back* against (على), of a horse or horseman, to *wheel about*, and *return* to the fight, of night or day, to *return* (Lane, 2600*c*), in Pilp. 2 S. 6[14. 16] to *turn about repeatedly*, *dance* (of David); *i.e.* "and will you *rush* (better, *turn round*) upon your friend?" But תָּכֹרוּ is very precarious, and in view of 40[30] there is no sufficient reason for deserting 𝔐. Besides, both תִּפְּלוּ and תָּכֹרוּ seem too strong to describe what Eliphaz has done: he has failed indeed in sympathy, but he has not "fallen upon" Job with the violence which these expressions would imply.

28. הואילו פנו] ἀσυνδέτως: G-K. 120*g*. In v.[9] with וּ: G-K. 120*d*.

29. וישבי, Kt.] rd., of course, with Qrê 𝔖𝔗 וְשֻׁבוּ.

30. בלשוני] either *in* my tongue (so that the tongue is perverted itself, and so speaks wrongfully), or *on* my tongue (Ps. 139[4]), referring directly to the words spoken. For הַוּוֹת 𝔖 expresses אֱמֶת, *truth*.

CHAPTER VII.

1. עלֵי] Qrê עֲלֵי, in better agreement with the usage of Job before a tone-syll., as 6^5 8^9 9^{26} 15^{27} 20^4 al. (Bu.).

2. כעבד] Hi. De. Bu.: *as* (those of) *a servant*, etc., carrying on כימי שכיר, and with a full stop at the end of [2]. This is possible (Ps. 18^{34}); but כעבד forms an awkward continuation of כימי שכיר.

ישאף, יקוה] rel. clauses, defining the *tertium comparationis* (Dr. 34; *Lex.* 454*a*). For שאף, lit. *pant*, see on 5^5.

פעלו] פֹּעַל, *wages*, as Jer. 22^{13}; פְּעֻלָּה is more usual, Lv. 19^{13}, Is. 40^{10} 49^4 al.

3. לי] *for myself*, marking the completeness of the possession. There is prob. no exact parallel; but cf. *Lex.* 516*a*.

מנו] מִנָּה in *Pi.* is in Heb. only poet. or late (Ps. 61^8, Jon. 2^1 $4^{6.7.8}$, 1 Ch. 9^{29}, Dn. $1^{5.10.11}$ †): it is common in Aram. (Dn. $2^{24.49}$ 3^{12}, Ezr. 7^{25}; and often in Tgg. and Syr.). In מִנּוּ the implicit subj. is הַמְמַנִּים; see on 4^{19}. This use of the indefinite 3rd pl. to express what we should denote by the passive ("nights of misery *are appointed* unto me") occurs elsewhere in Heb. (G–K. 144*f*, *g*), but it is particularly frequent in Aramaic and NH.: *e.g.* Dn. 4^{13} לִבְבֵהּ מן אנשא יְשַׁנּוֹן, $^{22.23.29}$ 5^{20}, in the ptcp. 3^4 $4^{22.28}$ (לָךְ אָמְרִין נבוכדנצר), ^{29} etc. (Kautzsch, *Gramm. des Bibl. Aram.* § 76*e*, 96*c*); *Pirḳê Abhoth*, 2^{16} 3^5 4^4 (כל הַמְחַלֵּל שם שמים בַּסֵּתֶר נִפְרָעִין ממנו בַּגָּלוּי): cf. in NT. Mt. 7^{16}, Mk. 10^{13}, Lk. 12^{20} *ταύτῃ τῇ νυκτὶ τὴν ψυχήν σου ἀπαιτοῦσιν ἀπὸ σοῦ*, 14^{35}, Jn. 15^6 20^2.

4. For the type of hypothetical see Dr. 138i, *a*, G–K. 112*gg*; and cf. v.$^{13f.}$ 10^{14} 21^6, Gn. 43^9. ואמרתי (with ו consec.) introduces the apodosis in a freq. sense. ואמֹרתי for וְאָמַרְתִּי, on account of the *rebhiʿa*: Dr. 104 (cf. Ps. 28^1). ושָׂבַעְתִּי should be ושבעתי (*ib.* 110. 2, *Obs.*).

מְדַּד] for the ַּ see G–K. 52*l*. The verb in Heb. means to *measure* (Ps. 60[8] al.); Arab. *madda* is to *extend, stretch out, prolong* (Lane, 2695 f.): cf. הִתְמֹדֵד, 1 K. 17[21], and מִדָּה, *extension, large size*, in אַנְשֵׁי מִדָּה, Is. 45[14] etc.; and מדד, if correct, must have this sense here. [Moreover, 𝔐 requires ערב to bear the meaning of לילה, *night*, for which Pr. 7[9] gives but a precarious support. In 𝔊 ערב receives its normal meaning, *evening*, or, strictly, the time of, or beginning with, (sun-)*setting*.] 𝔊 has *ἐὰν κοίμηθῶ, λέγω Πότε ἡμέρα; ὡς δ' ἂν ἀναστῶ, πάλιν Πότε ἑσπέρα*; whence Du. אם שכבתי ואמרתי מתי יום ואקום: ואם קמתי מתי ערב ושבעתי נדדים עדי נשף:, "If I lie down, I say, 'When (will it be) day, that I may arise?' And if I arise (I say), 'When (will it be) even?'" etc. נשף in 𝔐, of the *morning* twilight, as 3[9]; in the emended text, of the *evening* twilight, as 24[15]. [A slighter alteration than Du. proposes gives a better distich than he obtains, and gets rid of the unusual meanings which must be attributed to ערב and מדד if 𝔐 be retained. Read מִדֵּי for מדד and render:

When I lie down, I say, When shall I arise?
And as often as evening (comes), I am sated with tossings till (morning) twilight.

The rhythm is 4:4, an occasional though rare variant on the normal 3:3; see, *e.g.*, 3[8] 15[20].]

5. גיש] Qrê גּוּשׁ †; in NH. a *lump* or *clod*, as גוש עפר, גוש של אדמה, גוש של מלח (see *NHWB*.).

רָגַע †] to *become hard*, as in Eth. (Di. *Lex*. 317), *e.g.* for קפא, Ex. 15[8], Jb. 10[10], and the ptcp. *regu'* = *τετυρωμένος*, Ps. 67[16]; *πάγείς*, Wisd. 7[2].

וַיִּמָּאֵס] a "metaplastic" form of מָסַס, or, better, a mis-pointed וַיִּמָּאס, for וַיִּמַּס (G–K. 23*g*), in pause for וַיִּמָּס, from מסס, to *liquefy, melt* (Ex. 16[21], Ps. 68[3] al.). So Ps 58[8] יִמָּאֲסוּ כמו מים (rd. יִמַּסּוּ). 𝔖 here ܐܬܡܣܝ, 𝔗 איתמסי.

6. אֶרֶג] a *weaving apparatus*, in Jg. 16[14] the *loom*, here the part of the apparatus which moves to and fro, the *shuttle*. מַאֲרָג might have been expected (cf. Bu.); but קֶלַע, *sling*, is a word of the same form denoting the instrument.

7. תשוב לראות] G–K. 114*n* n.: cf. Dt. 30[9], 1 K. 13[17].

8. תשורני] שור 10 times in Job, Nu. 23^9 24^{17}, Jer. 5^{26}, Ca. 4^8, Hos. 13^7 14^9 †; and in שוררים, (insidious) *eyers*, in the Psalms.

9. [The form of sentence (without כאשר in 9^a) is rare: cf. *Lex.* 486*b*, 2*d*.]

וַיֵּלֵךְ] G–K. 29*q*, 69*p*.

11. אשיחה] The primary idea of שיח is to *muse* or *talk* (Ps. $77^{7\,(6).\,13\,(12)}$ 104^{34} $119^{23.\,27.\,48}$ 105^2, Pr. 6^{22}; and so שיחה is *musing*, Ps. $119^{97.\,99}$: cf. Jb. 15^4); but both these words and the subst. שיח often express the idea of *plaintive* musing or talking, *complain*, *complaint*, as 1 S. 1^{16}, and esp. in Job and the Pss., as here, v.^{13} 9^{27} 10^1 21^4 23^2, Ps. $55^{3\,(2).\,18\,(17)}$ $64^{2\,(1)}$ $77^{4\,(3)}$ $142^{3\,(2)}$.

13. ישא בשיחי] to bear *in*, *i.e.* share in bearing (*Lex.* 88*b*; G–K. 119*m*).

14. וחתתני] see on v.^{4}.

תבעתַני] G–K. 60*d*.

15. מעצמותי] rd. with Reiske, Me. Di. ("anmuthend"), Sgf. Bu. Du. al. מֵעַצְּבוֹתַי: *v. supr.*

16. מאסתי] Me. Sgf. Du. carry back into ^{15b}, rendering "Death I despise in comparison to (Du. because of) my pains." But מאס, to *reject* (*e.g.* Saul as king, 1 S. $15^{23.\,26}$), in so far as it means to "despise," is to despise so as to *reject*, not to despise while *accepting*. The ellipse of חיי (9^{21} אמאס חיי) is considerable; but its insertion would be vetoed by the current metrical systems. [Yet the insertion would produce 4 : 4 rhythm of which a few examples occur (see v.^{4} n.). The "sechser" (2 : 2 : 2), left if מאסתי is transferred to v.^{15}, is, as Sievers has felt, also exceptional.] De Dieu, Capellus, Rosenm. (cf. RVm.) derived מאסתי from מסס (cf. on v.^{5}); but this is not possible: Bi. obtained the same sense legitimately by emending to מַסּוֹתִי, *I melt* (waste) *away*: cf. 𝔙 *desperavi*.

17–18. וַתפקדנו must express a *fact*, not a contemplated possibility; hence it must either (as Dr. 39δ, 114β), if ^{17} be rendered (as EVV.) "that thou *shouldest* . . .," be separated from this and made an independent sentence, "Yea, thou visitest," etc.; or, which is better, ^{17} is to be rendered, "What is man, that thou *magnifiest* him (as a fact) . . ., and visitest,"

etc. The rend. of EVV., if exact, would require וּפְקַדְתּוֹ for וַתִּפְקְדֵנוּ (or ולבקרים תפקדנו); see Gn. 37^{26}. So Ps. 50^{16} is not "What is it to thee to declare my statutes, and that thou (AV.) *shouldest take* (וַתִּשָּׂא) my covenant upon my mouth?" but, "And that thou (RV.) *hast taken* my covenant upon thy mouth?" (On cases of . . . מה כי see *Lex.* כִּי, 1 f.).

19. כמה] See *Lex.* 553*b* (4 c). Here = *how long*? as Ps. 35^{17}. There is no reason to correct to עַד מה, or proof that 𝔊𝔖𝔙 read it.

20. For the hypoth., without a hypoth. particle, see Dr. 154; G–K. 159*h*; and cf. $4^{2.21}$.

לָ֫מָּה] so (*mil'ēl*) only here (*Lex.* 554*a*).

וָאֶהְיֶה] *so that* . . . this is an accommodation to English idiom: we cannot, after a word like *why*, change the person, as Heb. can, and say, "Why hast thou . . ., *and* I am," etc.? Cf. similar cases in Gn. 31^{27}, Jer. 20^{17}.

עָלַי] 𝔊 and 2 MSS have עָלֶיךָ, *upon thee*; and this, according to the Jews, was the original reading, 𝔐 being one of the 18 *tiḳḳunê sopherim*, or alterations made by the scribes in passages regarded as savouring of impiety (see Ginsburg, *Introd. to Heb. Bible*, p. 347 ff.; Geiger, *Urschrift*, p. 308 ff.; or, more briefly, Dr. on 2 S. 20^{1}). It is preferred by Me. De. Gr. Sgf. Bi. Buhl, Be. Du. But, as Bu. remarks, *upon thee* would form an anti-climax on the preceding line, whereas *upon myself* follows it naturally and forcibly, and Bi. only accepts it by assuming the meaning "butt" for משא ("burden"); and Be. by altering משא into מַטָּרָה, "butt" (16^{12}).

21. תשא] 𝔊 expresses תִּשָּׂא (תִּשֶׁה), *forget* (11^{6}); so Me. Wr

אשכב] 𝔊 Klo. אֵשֵׁב.

CHAPTER VIII.

2. [אָן] 1 S. 10[4], 2 K. 5[25] Kt.: usually אָנָה.

[מַלֵּל] (Aram.) the verb cognate with מִלָּה (4[4] n.).

[[רוח] masc. as 4[15] (n.).]

[כַּבִּיר] only in Jb. (15[10] 31[25] 34[17. 24] 36[5]) and Is. (16[14] 17[12] 28[2]) †; cf. the vb. הכביר, Jb. 35[16] 36[31] †, Arab. *kabîr*, Syr. ܟܒܝܪ (rare): the vb. is Arab. Eth. and Syr.

3. [יְעַוֵּת] properly to *make crooked*: see Qoh. 7[13]. The repetition of the same word is emphatic; but 𝔊 in [a] ἀδικήσει [never = עוּת; but cf. Am. 8[5], where לְעַוֵּת = ποιῆσαι . . . ἄδικον], in [b] ταράξει [= עוּת in 19[6] 34[12]: cf. also 34[10], La. 3[59]]: and so Be. יַעֲוֶה (cf. 33[27] יָשָׁר הֶעֱוֵיתִי) or יְעַקֵּשׁ (Mic. 3[9]) in either [a] or [b]; Du. in [b] יְעַוֶּה (La. 3[9]). [In view of 𝔊, the repetition here in 𝔐 is improbable: cf. G. B. Gray, *Forms of Hebrew Poetry*, 254, n. 3, 295 f.]

4. [וַיְשַׁלְּחֵם] *sent them away, let them go* = give over, as Ps. 81[13]. The introd. of the apod. by וַ [cf. 𝔊 ἀπέστειλεν] is unusual; but cf. 1 S. 15[23] (after יַעַן), Ps. 59[16], c. 36[9] (Dr. 127γ). Du., reading in [5] with 𝔊 וְאַתָּה for אם אתה, escapes this difficulty: "If thy sons have sinned against thee, *and* he have delivered them into the hand of their transgression, then (1 K. 8[32. 34. 36. 39]; Dr. 124) do *thou* seek," etc.

5. [תשחר אל אל] שחר elsewhere sq. accus.: שחר אל may be said on the analogy of דרש אל, 5[8] al. (Be.).

6. [זַךְ] 11[4] 16[17] 33[9], Pr. 16[2] 20[11] 21[8]: of *pure* oil, Ex. 27[20] = Lv. 24[2]; of *pure* frankincense, Ex. 30[34], Lv. 24[7] †. Cf. זָכַךְ, 15[15] 25[5]; זָכָה, 15[14] 25[4].

[כי עתה] *indeed then* (Dr. 144; *Lex.* 472*b*; G–K. 159*ee*); cf. Gn. 31[42] 43[10].

כי עתה יעיר עליך] 𝔊 δεήσεως ἐπακούσεταί σου, *i.e.* (Bi. Be.) יַעֲנֶה תפלתך, or Be. (alt.): יֵעָתֶר־לָךְ (Gn. 25[21]).

עליך] *on thy behalf*: *Lex.* 754*a* (*c*).—In order to reduce the triplet to a couplet, Bi.[2] Be.[T] excise v.[6a], and Me. Sgf. Du. Be.[K] v.[6b] [absent from one MS [Ken.]], as a gloss.

נְוַת צדקך] for נָוֶה see on 5[3]. The *fem.* only here and Zeph. 2[6] נְוֹת; rd. prob. each time נְוֵה. Cf. Jer. 31[23] נְוֵה צדק (of the future, ideal Jerusalem).

7. מצער] a *subst.*: G–K. 141*c*, *d*; Dr. 189. 2.

ישגה] v.[11], Ps. 73[12] 92[13] †; השגיא, 12[23] 36[24] †; שַׂגִּיא (adj.), 36[26] 37[23] (as [in Aram. of] Dn. 2[6. 12] and oft.) †. As Aram. shows, שגא (not שגה) is the correct orthography. The Aramaic equivalent of the Heb. רָבָה. The masc. after אחריתך is irregular; and Ol. De. Bi. Du. יַשְׂגֶּה, *shall make great*. This, however, injures the parallelism (Di. Bu.); and a good many cases of the irregularity occur—*e.g.* Ex. 12[49], Jg. 13[5], and esp. Pr. 2[10] 12[25] 29[25]; G–K. 145*u*; Kö. iii. 345*d* (assimilation to והיה, Kö. 251*i*, is not probable). Be. יַשְׂגֶּה or, after 𝔊 ἀμύθητα, שַׂגִּיאָה; but, *if* a change is needed, תִּשְׂגֶּה would be the natural one to make.

8. שאל ל׳] 2 K. 8[6].

רישון] cf. G–K. 23*e*.

כּוֹנֵן] *sc.* לבך: cf. שׁת לִבּוֹ, שָׂם לִבּוֹ, and שָׂם with ellipse of לב, 4[20] al. (see note). כּוּן לב, however, never occurs, though, as כון means to *fix* (a throne, a land, the moon, a city, a bowstring), there seems no reason why it should not occur; and הכין לב, to *direct*, *apply* the heart, though frequent, never occurs without לב (Jg. 12[6] is dub.: see Moore). Hence it is quite possible that בּוֹנֵן (Dt. 32[10] †) should be read (Ol. Sgf. Di. Du.): Bu.'s objection that only בִּין and התבונן occur elsewhere in Job is hardly decisive against it.

חקר] concrete, *what has been sought out*: cf. 11[7].

אבותם] *their* fathers, viz. those belonging to the successive generations implied in דור (Di.). But 𝔊𝔙, Lag. Sgf. Du. Be. אָבוֹת *the fathers*, parallel to דור רישן. But (Bu.), if a change is thought necessary, אֲבוֹתֵינוּ would be better than אָבוֹת.

9. תמול] constr. as שלום, 5[24]; וְאַתָּה מָרוֹם, Ps. 92[9], Dn. 9[23]

(Dr. 189. 2; G–K. 141*c*, *d*). Ol. Lag. Sgf. Du. St. מִתְּמֹל (but 𝕿 מאתמלי is no evidence of this reading, the מן being in Aram. necessary for the sense, just as "of yesterday" is in English).

10. יאמרו לך] rd. with 14 MSS (𝕲𝕾𝕿) וְיֹאמרו. The words are, however, rather flat after יורוך: hence Di. supposes them to be a gloss; and Be., after 𝕲, would read וְיַגִּידוּ לך (cf. 11^6).

11. יגאה] גאה, in Heb. only 10^{16}, Ex. $15^{1.21}$ (כי גָאֹה גָּאָה), Ezk. 47^5 † (of waters rising); גאות, Ps. 46^4 of the *rising* of the sea; גֵּאוּת of a *rising mass*, or *column*, of smoke, Is. 9^{17}; of the *swelling* of the sea, Ps. 89^{10}; cf. גאון גליך, Jb. 38^{11}; but the derivv. have usually the collat. idea of *majesty*, or *pride*: in Aram. also אתגאי, اتجأب, is to *show oneself exalted*, or *proud*. Hence the word is more than merely "grow up" (EVV.), it is to *rise up loftily* or *proudly*.

בלא] *Lex.* 520*a*.

ישגה] Bi. Be. אם ישנה, perhaps rightly [cf. 𝕲𝕾].

אָחוּ] as if from *aḥw*, like שְׂחוּ from *saḥw* (G–K. 93*x*).

בלי מים] Dr. 164. So בלי לבוש, 24^{10}; אין כסא, Is. 47^1.

12. עודנו באבו . . . ולפני וג׳] constr. as $1^{18.19}$ (Dr. 169). Nu. 11^{33} is an exact parallel: הבשר עודנו בין שניהם טרם יכרת ואף י׳ חרה בהם (cf. Ps. $78^{30.31}$).

לא יקטף] a circ. clause: Dr. 34 *end*, 162; G–K. 156*f*; cf. Lv. 1^{17}, Ps. 26^1. The emendation (Be.) בְּאִבְּלוֹ יקטף is unnecessary: אֵבֶל, *greenness*, is also a word not known to Hebrew.

13a. Cf. Pr. 1^{19} כן ארחות כל בֹּצֵעַ בצע; but there also 𝕲 אחרית yields a better sense. With 𝕲 τὰ ἔσχατα, cf. Sir. 2^3 ἐπ᾽ ἐσχάτων σου, obviously = באחריתך. אחרית may denote either the latter part (v.[7]), or the actual close, of life, according to the context.

14. יקוט †] if correct, from * קטט = Ar. *ḳaṭṭa*, to *cut across* (*e.g.* a strap or a thong) so as to *sever* (Lane, 2539): in this case, however, we should vocalize יָקֹט. The parallel בית עכביש suggests, however, a noun here, rather than a vb.; and Saad. has for יקוט, حبل الشمس, *sun-cords*, i.e. *gossamer* (cf. Germ. *Sommerfäden*, summer-threads = *gossamer*): hence Be. Du.

קוּרִים, *threads*, Is. 59[5] קורי עכביש יארגו, [6] קוריהם לא יהיו לבגד †. Is. 59[5, 6] do not indeed show that קורים, standing alone (without "of a spider"), would denote specifically a *spider's* threads: still, even if it did not do this, the following בית עכביש might suffice to suggest that meaning here. Be. (alt.) קִוִּים, or קָוִים, is a needless Aramaism (Is. 59[5] 𝔗) קוין, [6] קִיוִין [all in Levy]; cf. קַוָּאָה, a *spinner* or *weaver*, *Shabb.* 113*a*; ܩܘܐ ܩܘܝ (Jb. 7[6] for אֶרֶג), "a thrum of *threads*," PS. 650, cf. 3510),—unless, indeed, קֻוֵּי, קֻוֵּיהֶם are to be read in Is. 59[5, 6] for קורי, קוריהם, קור having no Heb. etymology, and not a satisfactory Arabic one, for *ḳawr* is not a "thread," but (Freyt.) *new cotton*, a *cord* or *rope of new cotton*. Bu.'s retranslation of the Germ. "Sommerfäden" into קְרֵי קַיִט (קַיִט, Aram. for קַיִץ), to take the place of אֲשֶׁר יָקוּם, is ingenious, but venturesome and precarious.

15. יקום] *maintain itself*, *endure*: syn. of עמד, as Jos. 7[12], לא יכלו .. . . לקום לפני אויביהם [13], 1 S. 13[14] ממלכתך לא תקום; c. 15[29], ולא יקום חילו.

16. רָטֹב] רָטֹב, 24[8] †; the √ is common in Aram.: *e.g.* רוטבא = לְשַׁד, Ps. 32[4]; רַטִּיב = לַח (opp. יבש), Nu. 6[3]; ܪܛܝܒ = ὑγρός, Lk. 23[31] (PS. 3894).

גנתו] the garden in which the חָנֵף is pictured as planted. What creepers, spreading over a garden, the writer is likely to have had in view, only, perhaps, one familiar with the East could tell us: possibly גַּגּוֹת, "over the *roofs*," is right (Bu.).

17. גל] a *heap* of stones (Gn. 31[46], Jos. 7[26] al.). [Me. Che. (*Exp.*, June 1897, p. 409) give גל the sense of *spring* (against which see next n.), and emending בית אבנים in the next line to בְּיֶתֶר אִבִּים, render,

His roots twine themselves together about a fountain,
He looks with delight on a luxuriance of fresh growths.]

ובית אבנים יחזה] "and he *seeth* the house (place) of stones" cannot be right; and many endeavours [mostly by emending יחזה, but see also last n.] have been made to obtain a better sense. (*a*) 𝔊 ζήσεται = יִחְיֶה (so Sgf. Gr. Du.), "Its (His) roots are twined about the spring (Ct. 4[12]); In the house of stones it (he) liveth," *i.e.* (Du.) it is planted in the most

favourable spot in the garden, in the well-house, up the walls of which it grows, flourishing better in the house of stone than other plants do in their beds. But גַּל, *spring* (cf. on 5[5]), is very uncertain (in Ct. 4[12b] † מַעְיָן should most probably be read, as in 4[12a]); nor can the sense obtained be said to be exactly satisfactory. (*b*) The Arab. *ḥazza* is to *cut*, *notch*, *incise* (hence, no doubt, חָזִיז, a *jagged* or *forked lightning-flash*); hence Bö. Matt. Ew. Vo. Di. (supposing חזה to have the same meaning, and taking בית in the sense of *between*, as in Pr. 8[2], Ezk. 41[9], and the Syr. ܒܝܬ; but it is better simply to *read* בֵּין, with Wr. Gr. Sgf. Be.) render, "And *cuts*, *pierces*, *between* the stones"—its roots force their way in between the stones, and so take a firm hold in the earth; similarly Hi. De. Di. (alt.), understanding, however, בית in its usual sense, and supposing "house (or place) of stones" to denote a *bed*, or *layer*, of stones, "And pierces the place of stones." But the sense *divide*, *cut*, *pierce* for חזה has no support in Heb.; and it is better in this case (Bu.) to have recourse to the √ *ḥazza*, חָזַז, and to read יְחָזְּזוּ (בית א׳ being a *casus pendens*), or יָחֹז. (*c*) Bi. יְחַזְּקוּ, Bu. יֹאחֵז (from אחז: cf. וַתֹּחֶז for וַתֹּאחֶז, 2 S. 20[9]; G–K. 68*h*), "*takes hold of* the place of stones," finding a firm support there. (*d*) Be. יחורו (from חָוַר, common in Aram. and NH. in the sense of *go round*, *e.g.* Ps. 26[6] 𝕿 for סבב: cf. חיורא and חוורת as the names of two spreading plants, Löw, *Aram. Pflanzennamen*, p. 156), "And they go about between the stones." If we were *sure* that חזז was in use in Heb., יָחֹז would be the best emendation: in view of this uncertainty, יֹאחֵז, the next best suggestion, may be right. There is no occasion to have recourse to the Aram. חזר.

18. [וְכִחֶשׁ בּוֹ] with the tone thrown back, in spite of the dag. f. implic. in ח, and with a consequent ֶ for ֵ, on account of the following tone-syll. בּוֹ (G–K. 29*g*: cf. לְצַחֶק בָּנוּ, Gn. 39[14. 17]). The waw consec. in the apod., Dr. 138*i*, *β*.

19. [הֵן] Be. הֵם, needlessly (the הוא, in this case, as Dr. 200, 201. 1, 3; but there is no example after הֵם). Whether this ם is presupposed (Be.) by 𝔊 *τοιαύτη* is doubtful: 𝔊 for [18b] has *οὐχ ἑόρακας τοιαῦτα*, which (cf. Du.) seems to express לֹא רָאִיתָ

כֵּהֵן = 𝔐 חַד [19] לֹא רְאִיתִיךָ, differently divided, so that, if this expl. of 𝔊 is correct, τοιαῦτα will presuppose ךָ- הן, and [19] τοιαύτη will correspond to הוא.

[משוש דרכו] 𝔊 καταστροφὴ ἀσεβοῦς—ἀσ. being a paraphrase of the suff., and κατ. representing משוש דרך; and those who think that the reference must be to the abrupt *close* of the godless man's prosperity, seek to emend on the basis of this. Thus Me. for משוש proposed מְשׁוּבַת; but משובה is not "Wendung" in a general sense, but specifically "turning *back*," *apostasy*. Be. מְסוֹס (Is. 10^{18}); but "melting away" is a questionable fig. to apply to a "way." Καταστροφὴ recurs 15^{21} (= שׁוֹדֵד), 21^{17} (= אֵיד), 27^{7} ὥσπερ ἡ κατ. τῶν ἀσεβῶν, paraphr. for כְּרָשָׁע: cf. Pr. 1^{18b} (not in 𝔐) ἡ δὲ κατ. ἀνδρῶν παρανόμων κακή: it might, therefore, express שֹׁד, or even, perhaps (Sgf.), מְשֹׁאָה (only in שֹׁאָה וּמְשֹׁאָה, 30^{3} 38^{27}, Zeph. 1^{5}, and in the pl. מַשֻּׁאוֹת, Ps. 73^{18} 74^{3} †), which resembles משוש more than שֹׁד does; and, as שֹׁד רשעים and שֹׁאַת רשעים are both said (Pr. 21^{7} 3^{25}), שֹׁד דרכו, or מְשֹׁאַת דרכו, might perhaps have been said likewise. But if the view taken above be correct, no change in the text is necessary.

[יצמחו] if correct, an extreme case of a sing. noun construed in a coll. sense as a pl. (G–K. 145*d*; cf. Is. 16^{4} תַּמּוּ רֹמֵס, etc., c. 19^{19}). But prob. יצמח should be read; so 𝔊 (ἀναβλαστήσει ἄλλον [*A* ἄλλο]), 𝔖 ܢܶܨܡܰܚ ܐܚܪܢܐ (so Walton and Lee; Urm. and Bar Bahl. ܢܰܨܡܰܚ; but the Af. also is intrans., PS. 3415); 𝔗𝔙 express the plural.

21. [עַד] *till*: rd. עֹד with practically all moderns.

[ימלה] for יְמַלֵּא; G–K. 23*e*, 75*qq*: cf. מִלּוּ, Ezk. 28^{16}.

22. [איננו] *it is not*,—after the *casus pendens*, as Gn. 37^{30} $42^{13.36}$ $44^{26.30}$ etc. A frequent elegancy, much more forcible and expressive than ואין אתל רשעים, for instance, would be: how inferior also אין יוסף ואין שמעון would be to יוסף איננו ושמעון איננו!

CHAPTER IX.

4. חכם לבב ואמיץ כח] a *casus pendens*, resumed by the sf. in אליו: cf. Ps. 107[5] רעבים גם צמאים נפשם בהם תתעטף, Is. 44[20] רֹעֶה אֵפֶר לֵב הוּתַל הִטָּהוּ.

אמיץ כח] The √ אמץ often with כח: v.[19], Nah. 2[2] אַמֵּץ כח, Pr. 24[5] ואיש דעת מְאַמֶּץ־כח, Am. 2[14] וחזק לא יְאַמֵּץ כחו, Is. 40[26] מֵרֹב אונים ואמיץ (rd. אֹמֶץ) כח, Jb. 36[19] וכל מַאֲמַצֵּי כח.

For [b], cf. Dr. 19; Dt. 5[23] מי כל בשר אשר שָׁמַע . . . וַיֶּחִי; La. 3[37] מי זה אמר וַתֶּהִי; Sir. 2[10].

5. אשר] might = *quod* (Ex. 11[7]; *Lex.* 83*a*, 8 β), "and they know not *that*," etc. (Di. Del.); *i.e.* it is done in a moment, before they have realized that He has overthrown them in His wrath. [But rhythm and parallelism alike are unfavourable to this view of the construction, and favour the view underlying the translation. We should perhaps read ידע ואשר (cf. 𝔖 ܠܐ ܝܕܥ ܣܘܣܩܝ); for a clause with ואשר and the pf. (cf. Dr. § 117) coupled with a participial clause, cf. Mic. 3[2f.] 4[6].]

6. יתפלצון] the vb. only here: פַּלָּצוּת, *trembling*, *horror*, 21[6] al.

7. חרס] Jg. 14[18] בטרם יבא הַחַרְסָה (but rd. prob. הַחֶדְרָה): otherwise only in n. pr. הר חרס, Jg. 1[35]; תמנת־חרס, 2[9]; מַעֲלֵה הֶחָרֶס, 8[13], Is. 19[18] (some MSS, but very dub., though no doubt עיר ההרס contains an *allusion* to it) עיר החרס (Σ πόλις ἡλίου, 𝔙 civitas solis).

8–10, regarded by Be. Du. Bu. as an insertion, on the ground that they speak of the creative works of God, whereas the context, both vv.[4–7] and v.[11ff.], relates to the destructive, or (v.[11f.]) elusive and arbitrary, character of His operations, and that the latter are alone in harmony with Job's argument, and present frame of mind.

8. בָּמֳתֵי] so Is. 14[14], Am. 4[13]; and in Qrê for במותי (*i.e.*

בָּמוֹתֵי), Dt. 32^{13}, Is. 58^{14}, Mic. 1^{3},—each time (Bu.) before a tone-syll. in pause (אָרֶץ, עָב, יָם). As בָּמוֹתֵי is the form which regularly occurs before suffixes, no doubt this—accented בָּמוֹתֵי (Bu.), with a toneless ult. between the two tone-syllables—should be always read: 𝔐 בָּמֳתֵי seems intended partly to secure a short vowel under מ, partly to get rid of the double plural (which, except in this word and מראשׁתי, 1 S. 26^{12} (text dub.), occurs only before suffixes, G–K. 87*s*), by *implying* that the abs. form is בָּמֶת (so Bu.) giving the word the form of a plur. from sg. בָּמֶת (with radical ת: cf. דְּלָתוֹת from דֶּלֶת). Cf. Kö. ii. 172, 411 f., 436.

ים] 3 MSS עָב,—doubtless from Is. 14^{14}.

[9. כסיל וכימה] Parallelism favours reading וכסיל (ו)כימה (cf. 𝔊𝔖𝔙), or, transposing, וכימה כסיל (cf. the order in 38^{31}, Am. 5^{8}: here 𝔊𝔖 read כימה immediately after עשׂה).]

11. הן יעבר עלי ולא אראה] "*Behold*, he passeth by me (whenever it may be), and I see him not!" the form of sentence suggesting, with some vividness, though not expressly in the form of a hypoth., a hypothetical case: so $12^{14.15}$ 19^{7} 23^{8}.

אראה] 𝔖𝔙 express אראהו (though it does not follow that they *read* this); but with verbs such as ראה and שׁמע the sf. is often dispensed with. [Yet here אראה ויחלף might be a wrong division (cf. Dr., *Samuel*², xxviii.) of what was intended to be read אראהו יחלף.]

ויחלף] חלף is a poet. syn. of עבר, esp. where swiftness or force is to be indicated: of a flood, Is. 8^{8}; a tempest, 21^{1}; a breath, Jb. 4^{15}: cf. also 11^{10} (of God), 9^{26}, Hab. 1^{11}. In prose, only 1 S. 10^{3} (where Ehrlich would read וְהָלַכְתָּ).

לו] ל is the *nota accus.* (as 5^{2}): with בין, as 14^{21} 23^{8}, Pr. 14^{15}, Dt. 32^{29}, Ps. 73^{17} 139^{2} (with הבין, differently, c. 6^{24}).

12. הן יחתף מי ישיבנו] here, unless ומי should be read, מי definitely introduces the apod., and הן is more distinctly *if*; so 40^{23} (unless וְלֹא יחפז be read).

יחתף †] Aram. ܚܛܦ is to *break in pieces*. Rd., with 3 MSS, יַחְטֹף, *seise*, Jg. 21^{21}, Ps. 10^{9} † (as ܚܛܦ, *e.g.* = *συναρπάζειν*, Acts 6^{12}): add Pr. 23^{28} [Sir. 50^{4}], where for חֶתֶף

rd. חֹטֵף,—אַף הִיא כְּחֹטֵף תֶּאֱרֹב (like a *seizer, robber*). Σ here *ἀναρπάσει*. [Cf. the gloss in Sir. 15[17] וישיתהו ביד חותפו.]

13. רהב] 𝔊 *κήτη τὰ ὑπ' οὐρανόν* (cf. 26[12b] *τὸ κῆτος* = רהב).

15. אשר] = *I, who* . . . (*Lex.* 82*a*, 3): [אשר is not omitted in 𝔊 (Be.[K] Du.), but represented by *γάρ*].

אענה] 𝔖 Hfm. Siegfried Gr. Be. Bu. אֶעֱנֶה (11[2]), unnecessarily.

לִמְשֹׁפְטִי] to my *opponent-at-law*: ptcp. of the "conjug. of attack" (Po'el), G–K. 55*b, c*: cf. 1 S. 18[9] עוֹיֵן, *to be-eye*, Ps. 101[5] לוֹשֵׁן, *to be-tongue* (in slander). But Hi. Hfm. Bu. לְמִשְׁפָּטִי should supplicate *for my right* (to get justice). 𝔊 (or rather Aq. or Θ) *τοῦ κρίματος αὐτοῦ*. The change is not necessary; but Di.'s objection that התחנן is not construed with ל of the thing is hardly conclusive against it; for many similar words are so construed, as Gn. 41[55] ויצעק . . . ללחם, c. 15[23] נֹדֵד הוּא לַלֶּחֶם (*Lex.* 515*a*). Gr. לְמוֹ שֹׁפְטִי.

16. 𝔊[B] Be.[K] Du. וְלֹא יַעֲנֵנִי, "If I called, he would *not* answer me; I cannot believe that he would hearken to my voice" [which is rhythmically easier]. But the change of ולא יענני, if it once stood here, into וַיַּעֲנֵנִי is not a likely one; and if "and he answered me" is explained as is done above, the emendation is not necessary.

17. [אשר, *for, forasmuch as*: *Lex.* 83*b*.]

שערה] Nah. 1[3] †; שַׂעַר, Is. 28[2]; שְׂעָר, 27[21], Ps. 50[3], Dn. 11[40] †. Elsewhere each word always with ס (including Jb. 38[1] 40[6] סְעָרָה).

ישופני] would *bruise* me (𝔊 *ἐκτρίψῃ*; 𝔖 ܢܫܘܦܢܝ; 𝔙 conteret, שׁוּף, as Gn. 3[15], Ps. 139[11] † (but rd. here יְסֻפֵּנִי): cf. Aram. שׁוּף, שְׁפַף, ܫܳܦ (PS. 4099*f*), to *rub*, *e.g.* with a file, Ex. 32[20] 𝔖 ܫܳܦܶܗ ܒܫܽܘܦܺܦܳܐ, 𝔗 וְשַׁף עַד דַּהֲוָה דַקִּיק, Dt. 9[21] 𝔗 וְשָׁפִית יָתֵיהּ בְשׁוֹפִינָא; fig. 4[20] to *crush* (the poor, etc.), 𝔗 Ps. 72[4] (for וִידַכֵּא), 89[24] (for וְכַתּוֹתִי) al. There is no need to take שוף as = שָׁאַף, to *pant* (after), *be eager* for, Ps. 56[2] כי שְׁאָפַנִי אנוש, al. (Ew. Di. Bu. Du.): the objection that bruises cannot be multipled ([b]) upon one who is already "crushed" is hypercritical: [b] is not necessarily subsequent to [a], but may well be parallel to it; and

ישופני is not, any more than the figures in 16^{9-14}, to be understood with literal exactness. 𝔗 curiously דְעַד חוטי בִּינְתָא מדקדק עמי who deals finely (exactly) with me even to a hair's breadth (*i.e.* בִּשְׂעָרָה: cf. Levy, *ChWB.* 94*a*, 184*b*; *Yeb.* 121*b*, הק"בה מדקדק עם הצדיקים כחוט הַשַּׂעֲרָה.

והרבה] with *waw* consec. after ישופני, as v.^{21}, Am. 9^{3}. (Dr. 113. 3).

18. הָשֵׁב] irreg. for the *inf. c.*, Nu. 20^{21} 21^{23}, or, more usually (Gn. 20^{6} etc.), the *inf. c.* with לְ (G–K. 114*m*; Kö. iii. 414*g*: cf. *Lex.* 679*d*, g).

ישביעַני] G–K. 60*d*.

מַמְּרֹרִים] from מְמֹּרֹר †, with d. f. dirimens (G–K. 20*h*); but rd. מִמְּרֹרִים (מן after שׂבע, as Ps. 104^{13} al.), or (3 MSS) בִּמְרֹרִים (cf. La. 3^{15} הִשְׂבִּיעַנִי בַמְּרוֹרִים).

19. הנה and מי יועידני] as the text stands, "He saith" must be understood before each of these, and הנה must be taken as the challenger's call that he is ready: "Here I am!" "Wohlan!" (Di. De. Bu.). הנה, however, nowhere else stands alone for "Here I am!": there is nothing to suggest, at least in ^{a}, the implicit "He saith"; between "I" denoting Job in ^{18} and ^{20}, "I" in ^{19} cannot denote God (Be.); hence Hi. Me. Hfm. Be. Klo. Du. הִנֵּהוּ (Jer. 18^{3}, Kt.), or הִנֵּה = הִנּוֹ (*Lex.* 243*b*), with יועִדֶנּוּ (𝔊𝔖) in ^{b}. Still, the challenge in Yahweh's mouth is remarkably fine and bold (Bu.): "He saith" is often understood in Heb. poetry; and if הִנְנִי were read for הנה, the sense would show that God was the speaker.

20. אֶצְדָּק] the pausal form, for אֶצְדַּק, with the minor disj. *tifḥa*, like ^{b} אָנִי, ^{21a} אֲנִי; Dr. 103.

פי] Ol. Me. Wr. Hfm. Sgf. Be.^{T} (Be.^{K} with ?) פִּיו; but while there is force in emphasizing Job's mouth, there would be no point (Bu. Du.) in specially mentioning the "mouth" of God.

תם אני ויעקשני] "I am perfect, *and* he hath," etc. = "*If* I am perfect, he hath [= will have]," etc.: cf. 3^{25a} 23^{13}, וְנַפְשׁוֹ אִוְּתָה וַיָּעַשׂ, 29^{11}, Pr. 11^{2} בא זדון וַיָּבֹא קלון (Dr. 153; G–K. 159*h*, 3rd case).

וַיַּעְקְשֵׁנִי] Hif. for וַיְעַקְּשֵׁנִי: G–K. 53*n*. Bu. Du. Be.^{K} יְעַקְּשֵׁנִי (or יַעְקְשֵׁנִי), as the Hif. of עקשׁ does not occur: Bu. Be. also יְ

(not וִי); but this implies an improbable use of *waw* of the apodosis.

21–22. Du. reconstructs thus (the last cl. from [24b]): תם אני לא אדע נפשׁי אמאס חיי אחת הִיא: תם ורשׁע הוא מכלֶה אם לא אפוֹ מי הוּא [a succession of four-stressed lines!].

23. מַסַּת] (*a*) *melting away, despair*, from √ מָסַס (cf. מָס, 6^{14}, —if correct); so Ew. Di. De. ("perh."), Bu. Du. (*b*) *trial*, from √ נָסָה, as מַסָּה, Dt. 4^{34} al., and in particular trial by calamity, like NT. *πειρασμός*: so Hi., Ges. De.—Ges. De. actually rendering "calamity" (hence RVm.). Gr. Che. לְמַסַּת.

24. נתנה] 𝔖 Be.[K] נִתְּנָה.

אם לא אפו מי הוא] "If not, then, who is it?" cf. 24^{25} ואם לא אֵפוֹ מי יכזיבני, Gen. 43^{11} אם כן אֵפוֹא זאת עֲשׂוּ, "If it is so, then, do this." אֵפוֹ(א) is an enclitic particle, always following the word, or words, to which it relates: see, further, *Lex.* 66*a*. Acc. to the Massorah (Baer, *Job*, p. 39), it is always written אפוא, except in Jb. 17^{15} $19^{6.23}$ 24^{25}. Baer and Ginsb. have אֵפוֹא here; but Kit. with Hahn and other edd. have אֵפוֹ. The סביר (see on 1 S. 12^{5}; Ginsb. *Introd. to Hebrew Bible*, p. 187 ff.) אם לא הוא מי אפוא has nothing to recommend it.

25. לא ראו] a circ. cl. (Gn. 44^{4}): Dr. 162, 163; G–K. 156*f*.

26. חלפו] see on v.[11].

עם] *with = like*, as 37^{18} 40^{15} (*Lex.* 768*a*).

אֵבֶה†] Arab. *'abā'* (coll.), *arundines* (Freyt.) = כְּלֵי־גֹמֶא, Is. 18^{2}. [Both expressions refer to] craft made of reeds, light and swift [cf. Plut. *Isis and Osiris*, c. 18; Pliny, *N.H.* vi. 24 ("papyraceae naves"); Lucan, iv. 136 (conseritur bibula Memphitis cymba papyro)]; Heliod. *Aeth.* x. 460. See, further, Erman, *Life in Ancient Egypt*, 479 ff.; the notes on the present passage in Schultens, Hi., *SBOT* on Is. 18^{2}, *E.Bi.* 4025 [4478] and *s.v.* Egypt, § 8, end. [אבה was misunderstood by the ancient versions: 𝔊 renders (?) ἴχνος ὁδοῦ; 𝔗 connects אבה with אֵב and renders דמעינן מנריא, cf. 𝔙 "poma portantes"; Symm. σπεύδουσαι connects with אבה, *to wish*; so Levi ben Gershom, אבה הוא מענין רצון, AVm. "ships of desire." Many MSS of 𝔐 and 𝔖 read איבה, enmity. The view that אניות אבה are "boats of reeds" is recorded along with others in the mediæval (12th cent.)

Hebrew commentary on Job edited by W. A. Wright (1905): עם אניות אבה כאניות איבים ולסטין הנופלים פתאם על האדם ויש או' אבה נושאים אביב כי הם ממהרות לרוץ שרוצים למכור בעדו באיבו וגם יש או' שאניות עשויות מגמא (cf. Is. 18²) כי בעוד הגומא לח יעשו הספינות. But the correct etymology and the modern acceptance of the explanation "ships of papyrus" are due to Hiller, *Hierophyticon* (1725), part 2, p. 202, and Schultens (1737).]

יטוש †] 𝔖𝔗 טוס, to *fly*, as Hab. 1⁸ 𝔗 כנישרא דטאים למיכל, Is. 31⁵, Jb. 5⁷.

27. אמרי] rd. אמרתי (so Kenn. 192). The inf. after אם is wholly against usage. The inf. might stand as the subj. of a sentence (2 S. 15²⁰, Jer. 9⁵); but hardly in Jg. 19⁹: Zeph. 3²⁰ is corrupt; in Ps. 23⁶ rd. וישבתי.

ואבליגה] [הבליג, *to look cheerful, brighten up*, 10²⁰, Ps. 39¹⁴; but in Am. 5⁹ † (if the text be correct) transitively, *to cause to be bright*, or *flash forth*. The proper names בלגה, בלגי, may, *perhaps*, be from the same root; the noun מבליגית (Jer. 8¹⁸ †) is textually doubtful (cf. 𝔊). Mediæval Jewish philologists conjectured, wrongly as we now know, that בלג meant *to recover strength*, *strengthen* (hence the renderings in RV.; see Dr. on Am. 5⁹). The real meaning, which is strictly synonymous with the preceding phrase (אעזבה פני) here, is, as Schultens pointed out, clear from the Arabic: بلج means *to have a clear space between the eyes, to have a cheerful countenance, to be cheerful*; بلجة means *inter alia, the light in the last part of the night, the light of dawn*. Mohammed was said to be ابلج الوجه, *bright*, or *cheerful of countenance*: see Lane, p. 245 f.]

29. ארשע] "I *am to be* guilty," viz. in the judgment and estimate of another (Hi.): cf. 10¹⁵ 12⁴ 15²⁸ 17⁶ 19¹⁶ 34⁶, 1 S. 20⁵ ("*ought* to sit"), 28¹ ("that with me thou *oughtest to* go forth in battle"): Dr. 39*a*; G–K. 107*n*, end.

30. במו, Kt.] so 𝔊; 𝔖𝔙𝔗 express Qrê בְּמֵי. במו is preferable: "snow-*water*," or melted snow, is not particularly suggestive of either whiteness or cleanness.

והזכותי] the pf. with וְ consec. carrying on אם התרחצתי, which means, "If I wash myself at *any* time," and is virtually

= אם אחרתץ (Dr. 138 beg. comp. with 136 beg.), and is hence continued by the pf. with ו consec., as 11[13] (notice ופרשׂתָּ), Gen. 43[9] אם לא הביאתיו אליך והצגתיו לפניך, the tone being held back by the minor disj. accent (Dr. 104).

31. אָז] introducing the apod. Very rare, except where the prot. has לו or לולא, and only for the sake of emph. (as here, Is. 58[14], Pr. 2[5] †): see Dr. 136*a*, *Obs.* 2; *Lex.* 23*a*. In an ordinary conditional sentence, "then" in EVV. simply expresses ו (as 8[18]).

בשחת] that the "pit" is conceived as containing mud and water is evident from the context. 𝔊 ἐν ῥύπῳ, whence Hfm. בְּסֻחוֹת, Be. Du. בַּסְּחָה or בְּסָחָה. But there is no evidence that סוחה (Is. 5[25] †) or סְחִי (Lam. 3[45] †; cf. the vb. Ezk. 26[4] † וְסִחֵיתִי עֲפָרָהּ ממנה: prop. something *washed off* or *away*; cf. Aram. סְחִי, ܣܚܐ, to *wash oneself*), *offscourings, refuse* (𝔗 סְחִיתָא, Zeph. 1[7], for גְּלָלִים) denotes anything liquid, in which a person might be immersed.

שלמותי] Lag. "מְשַׁלְמַי vel simile quicquam," Du. שְׁלֹמַי, *my friends* (Ps. 7[5]); very needlessly,—"ein schlechter Einfall," Bu.

32. לא איש וג׳] "(it is) not a man like myself (that) I might answer him": לא, as Gen. 29[7] לא עת הֵאָסֵף המקנה, 2 K. 4[23] (*Lex.* 519*a*, b). אעננו and נבוא are voluntatives, without ו (Dr. 64, *Obs.*). So יָשֵׁת, v.[33] (cf. G–K. 109*i*).

33. לא] 13 MSS, 𝔊 (εἴθε), 𝔖 לוּ=לא, which, as לא יש (for אין) does not recur elsewhere in Heb., is preferred by Me. Sgf. Bi. Gr. Be. Bu. (for לו יֵשׁ see 16[4], Nu. 22[29]). Hi. De. Di. Du. prefer לא, objecting to לו that, as [32] denies that God and man are on an equality with each other, it is idle to wish for an umpire to whom both would have to submit, and pointing out also that [34] does not continue the (supposed) wish of [33] that there were such an umpire, but rests upon the supposition that no such umpire exists. The passionate wish, "O that there *were*—there is some emph. in the יש—an umpire between us!" would be in itself thoroughly in keeping with Job's frame of mind; but it must be admitted that לא יש (which might have been chosen for the assonance with לא איש in [32]) suits the present context better.

34. תבעתַנִי] as 7[14].

CHAPTER X.

1. נָֽקְטָה] The √ is קוט, so the form ought to be נָקֹטָּה (cf. Ezk. 20^{43} 36^{31} וּנְקֹטֹתֶם); but vbs. ע״ו sometimes follow the analogy of vbs. ע״ע; hence וְנָקֹטּוּ (G–K. 67*t*), Ezk. 6^{9} for וְנָקֹטוּ, and here (implicitly) נָקֹטָּה (G–K. 72*dd*), written נָֽקְטָה, with neglect of the duplication, like נָסַבָּה for נָסַבָּה, Ezk. 41^{7} (G–K. 69*dd*).

עלי] 𝔊 ἐπ' αὐτόν = עָלָיו, *against him* (God): so Me. Be. Du.; but the change is no improvement, besides being unnecessary.

2. תריבני] with sf. in the acc., as Dt. 33^{8}, Is. 27^{8} † (in Is. 49^{25} את is the prep., as Pr. 25^{9} al.); G–K. 117*x*.

3. [יגיע כפיך] what thy hands have toiled to produce: cf. יגיע כ׳, Gn. 31^{42} (‖ עָנְיִי), Hag. 1^{11} (the result of a farmer's labour), Ps. 128^{2} † (so BDB.). The root meaning of יגע, *to toil, grow weary*, probably makes itself sufficiently felt in the phrase יגיע כ׳ to give it a different nuance from מעשה ידיו, which suggests the skill, whereas יגיע כ׳ suggests the toil, required to produce a thing. Since man's work involves both skill and toil, both phrases may obviously and naturally be applied to the same human labours: so, *e.g.*, in Hag. 2^{17} the result of work in the fields is מעשה ידיו, in 1^{11} יגיע כ׳. God's work is elsewhere and most naturally described as מעשה ידיך: יגיע כפיך used of God's work here is altogether exceptional and therefore particularly noticeable.]

6. לעוני] בקש ל׳, as Pr. 18^{1} †, ל being the *nota accus.*: cp. 5^{2} n. דרש ל׳, to *inquire about*, as 2 S. 11^{3}: דרש (abs.), of a judicial inquiry, Dt. 13^{15} $17^{4.\,9}$ 19^{18}.

7a. על] = *notwithstanding* (*Lex.* 754*b*), as 16^{17} 34^{6}; and, before a rel. cl., Is. 53^{9}.

7b. Be. וְאֵין בְּיָדַי פֶּשַׁע (1 S. 24^{12}), Du. Be.^{K}: ואין בידי מַעַל,— to improve the parallelism with ^{a}.

8. יחד סביב ותבלעני] 𝔊 μετὰ ταῦτα μεταβαλών με ἔπαισας (𝔖 also ܘܡܢ ܒܬܪ ܟܢ for יחד); whence Me. Wr., for יחד סביב, אַחַר תָּשׁוּב; De. Di. אַחַר תְּסוֹב ("perhaps better"); Bi. Bu. סַבֹּתָ; Be. סַבֹּתָ or שַׁבְתָּ; Du. Ho. (inf. abs.) אַחַר סָבוֹב: תְּסוֹב seems the best.

10, 11. The actions described are depicted graphically by the impff. (Dr. *27a*). Notice the rhyme: 4 lines each ending in *-ēni*.

11. תְּשֹׂכְכֵנִי] didst *intertwine* me, EVV. *knit* me *together*: Po'el from שָׂכַךְ (only here) = סָכַךְ, Ps. 139^{13} † תְּסֻכֵּנִי בבטן אמי (סוך, cf. once, La. 2^6 שׂוך); סֻכָּה something *intertwined*, a *thicket*, *booth*; NH. הֵסֵךְ, to *weave*.

12. חיים וגו׳] "life and kindness hast thou *done* (or *made*) with me" (EVV. "granted" conceals the difficulty and peculiarity of the Heb.). עשה חסד (חסד ואמת (or עם is a common expression; and if the text is right, חיים must be joined with חסד by zeugma. Di. compares 4^{10} שאגת אריה וקול שחל ושני כפירים (נתעו (נתצו, where the verb is obviously unsuitable to שאגה. Still the zeugma here is an extreme one; and Be.'s חֵן for חיים (cf. Est. 2^{17} ותשא חֵן וָחֶסֶד לפניו) is clever and plausible. 𝔊 has ἔθου for עשית; whence Du. שַׂתָּ עמדי (11^{17}) חיים וָחֶלֶד, "Leben und *Lebenskraft* hast du mir zugegeben"; but שִׂית עִם is not to "grant *to*," nor is there any evidence that חלד means "Lebens*kraft*."

14. ושמרתני] Sgf. om. ו as dittogr. from ומעוני; Be.^{T} (not Be.^{K}) om. ו, as not read by 𝔊𝔖. But (1) καί is not needed by Greek idiom; so there is no evidence that 𝔊 did not read ו: in 7^4 𝔊 has λέγω for ואמרתי, in 8^{18} ψεύσεται for וְכִחֶשׁ, in 21^6 ἐσπούδακα for ונבהלתי, in Ps. 89^{33} ἐπισκέψομαι for ופקדתי, in Gn. 18^{26} ἀφήσω for ונשאתי, in 24^8 καθαρὸς ἔσῃ for ונקית; see also $43^{8.(9)}$ $47^{5b\,(6b)}$ etc.; 𝔖 expresses ו in 7^4 8^{18}, but not in 21^6, Ps. $89^{32\,(33)}$, Gn. 18^{26} 24^8 43^9 47^6; nor (2) is the omission necessary or even desirable. The syntax of the passage is indeed unique: what in God's mouth would be אם חָטָא ושמרתיו ומעונו לא אנקנו (2 S. 15^{33}, 2 K. 7^4) is turned into oblique narrative in order to

express Job's *thought* of what God would do; but it does not appear why, in this change, the וְ before 'שׁ should be omitted, and לא תנקני in [b] and לא אשא in [15] are distinctly against its omission; for in the apodosis of a hypoth. sentence the bare impf. and the pf. with וְ cons. are syntactically equivalent, and mutually interchangeable; comp. *e.g.* Gn. 18^{26} with [28], Jg. $11^{30f.}$ with 13^{16a} (see further instances in Dr. 136 i, *a* and *β*, 138 i, *a* and *β*, ii, *a* and *β*).

15. אַלְלַי] Mic. 7^1 †. Cf. אֱלִי (Jl. 1^8 †), أَلَّ, to *lament*; and Eth. *alê*, "woe!" (Di. *Lex.* 718).

רְאֵה] The imper. of ראה (though doubtless so meant by the punctuation) does not agree with the context: so רְאֵה, if right, must be the *st. c.* of רָאֶה, a verbal adj. of the same form as קָשֶׁה, רָוֶה, *soaked*, *saturated*, as גַּן רָוֶה, Is. 58^{11}; כָּלֶה, Dt. 28^{32} (עֵינַיִם כָּלוֹת). But Geiger (*Jüd. Zsch.* iv. 213, v. 191, ix. 130), Che. Lag. Di. Del. Be. Bu. וּרְוֵה עָנְיִי, "and *saturated* with affliction" (not "*my* affliction"): cf. La. 3^{15} הִשְׂבִּיעַנִי בַמְּרוֹרִים הִרְוַנִי לַעֲנָה; also, for the same two words in parallelism, Jer. 31^{14} וְרִוֵּיתִי נפש הכהנים דָּשֶׁן וְעַמִּי אֶת־טוּבִי יִשְׂבָּעוּ. 𝔊 does not express וראה עניי. Du. deletes [15c. 16a], as both disturbing to the metre and interrupting the thought,—[16b. 17a] (the next distich) carrying on the thought of [15ab]: the lines (for which 𝔊 has πλήρης γὰρ ἀτιμίας εἰμί (שָׂבֵעַ קלון אָנִי), ἀγρεύομαι γὰρ ὡς λέων εἰς σφαγήν (=וּלְהֵרֵגָה כשחל יצודני),—but the comparison to a hunted and slain *lion* is hardly probable) he supposes to be a quotation from some well-known place by a scribe (Be.[K] del. as gloss, with a ?).

16–17. The verbs are all jussives; notice תָּשֹׁב and esp. תְּרֶב: for the double jussive in a conditional sentence, see Dr. 152. 3; cf. in Arabic, 151, *Obs.*; G–K. 109*h*.

תשב תתפלא] = thou wouldest *again* show thyself marvellous (G–K. 120*g*).

17. עדיך נגדי] 𝔊 (ἐπανακαινίζων) ἐπ' ἐμὲ τὴν ἔτασίν μου (𝔊[A] σου), whence Bi.[2] נְגָעַי (so long as I live) עָדַי, Be.[T] (or נגעך) עָלַי נְגָעַי, Ho. עָלַי נְגָעֶיךָ: for ἔτασις = נֶגַע, cf. Gn. 12^{17} καὶ ἤτασεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν Φαραω ἐτασμοῖς μεγάλοις = וַיְנַגַּע י' את־פ' נגעים גדולים. נֶגַע does not occur elsewhere in Job; but

see Ps. 38^{12} מִנֶּגֶד נִגְעִי יַעֲמֹדוּ, and 39^{11} חָסֵר מעלי נגעך (varied from Jb. 9^{34a}). Che. מוֹעֲדָיו "his *troops*"; but the sense is too uncertain (Is. 14^{31} †).

כעשך] כעש for כעס, see on 5^2.

חליפות וצבא עמי] 𝔊 ἐπήγαγες δὲ ἐπ' ἐμὲ πειρατήρια (πειρ. = צבא, 7^1, = גדוד, 19^{12}, Ps. 18^{30}, Gn. 49^{19}), 𝔖 ܘܫܘܚܠܦܐ, ܡܫܚܠܦܝܢ ܠܘܬܝ ܟܠܗܘܢ, 𝔗 מתחלפן מחוואתא מיתחיילן גבאי, 𝔙 et pœnæ militant in me. Unless Job is passing from the description of God's intention ("*wouldest* renew," "*wouldest* increase") to a description of the *fact*,—and even then, whether we render "relays (1 K. 5^{28}) and a host are (in conflict) with me," or (Di.) as an exclam., "relays and a host (in conflict) with me!" the combination "relays and a host" is strange, and a verb is strongly desiderated—read וְתַחֲלִף צְבָאֶיךָ עִמִּי, "and *thou wouldest renew* (Is. 40^{31} 41^1) thy hosts (= bring fresh hosts: cf. for the figure יחד יבאו גדודיו, 19^{12}) against me" (cf. Che. *Exp.*, June 1897, p. 409, תחליף צבאיך עמי, though he regards the words as a gloss on ^{17a}). Kt.$^{Or.}$ יצבא, read as יַצְבָּא (or תַּצְבָּא), *wouldst muster* (2 K. 25^{19} = Jer. 52^{25}), would also suit, with less change in the Heb. Bu. וְתַחֲלִף צְבָאֲךָ עָלָי ("and wouldest renew thy *warfare*"), Du. וְתַחֲלִף צָבָא עלי; but עִמִּי may remain (in spite of עמדי in ^{a}): it is idiom. in the sense of "(in conflict) *with*," 9^{14}, Ps. 94^{16} (*Lex.* 767*b*, c).

18. אגוע] I *ought to have* expired, and so אהיה and אובל in ^{19} (Dr. 39β; and on 9^{20}). 𝔊 καὶ οὐκ ἀπέθανον, and οὐκ εἶδεν, and οὐκ ἀπηλλάγην in 19^b, not understanding the force of the impf., and paraphrasing to make sense.

20. יחדל] Kt. יֶחְדַּל, Qrê וַחֲדָל. But for ימי יחדל 𝔊 has (ἢ οὐκ ὀλίγος ἐστὶν) ὁ βίος τοῦ χρόνου μου ('Α Syr.-H., Hier. Copt. Arab.$^{Baud.}$ better, ὁ χρόνος τοῦ βίου μου), and 𝔖 ܝܘܡܬܐ ܕܚܝܝ = יְמֵי חֶלְדִּי, a "schöne Lesung" (Bu.), obviously superior to either יחדל or וחדל; so Wr. Bi.^{2} Be. Bu. Du. Ho. St. On חלד, *v.* on 11^{17}.

וישית] Kt. יָשִׁית (juss., for יָשֵׁת), Qrê וְשִׁית (imper.). With שית an ellipse of ידו, פניו, עיניו, לבו (7^{17}: cp. Is. 41^{22}) might be supposed; but though to set the hand, face, etc., *upon* or *to* is intelligible, to set . . . *from* is not a natural expression;

we should expect "to *remove* from." Du. *Lass ab von mir*, suggesting that "שית מן is perhaps a techn. term from the workshop or war; cf. שית in Ps. 3^7 אשר סביב שָׁתוּ עלי (Is. 22^7), and שִׂימוּ 1 K. 20^{12}; a word like יָד may be supplied"; but the difficulty of setting the hand "*from*" still remains. 𝕲 ἔασόν με (= שְׁעֵה, 7^{19}), 𝕾 פריק; and שְׁעֵה, or יִשַׁע, is very probable. Cf. especially Ps. 39^{14} (noticing the sequel) הָשַׁע (rd. שְׁעֵה,—or, at least, if the Hif. was really in use, הָשַׁע) ממני ואבליגה בטרם אלך ואינני.

21. צלמות] see on 3^5.

22. עֵפָתָה] Am. 4^{13} (עֵיפָה) †; cf. מְעוּף (in מעוף צוקה), Is. 8^{22} †, מוּעָף, v.[23] †, and תְּעוּפָה (תְּעֻפָה), Jb. 11^{17} †. The ה—ָ, by G–K. 90*g*. 'עֵ seems to be the Mass. reading (*v.* Gi.): the MSS which Baer prefers have 'עֵי (see Baer, p. 40).

ולא סדרים] = *and disorders*, the לא negativing 'ס, as in בחרב לא־איש, הם קנאוני בלא־אל . . . ואני אקניאם בלא־עם, etc. (G–K. 152*a*, *note*). סֵדֶר, only here in OT.,—though שְׂדֵרוֹת, *rows*, *ranks*, 2 K. $11^{8.15}$ = 2 Ch. 23^{14} (cf. 1 K 6^9; Jg. 3^{23}) † is substantially the same word,—means *ordered arrangement*, *row*: both סַדֵּר, to *set in order*, and סֵדֶר are common in Aram. and NH. (עָרַךְ = סַדֵּר, Gn. 22^9 𝕿; מַעֲרָכָה = סִדְרָא Lv. 24^6 𝕿). 𝕲 for ולא סדרים has οὐ οὐκ ἔστιν φέγγος = ולא נְהָרָה (3^4): Schwally, *Leben nach d. Tode*, 1892, p. 61 *n.*, Be.

ותפע] and *it* shineth; G–K. 144*c*. The poet dwells upon the thought of the great darkness of Sheol. To some critics, however, parts, or even the whole, appear to be tautologous; and so Bi. Du. suppose the whole v. to be an expansion of [21b] by a later hand, while Me. Sgf. Gr. Che. Be.[T] excise ותפע כמו אפל as a faulty dittograph of עפתה כמו אפל. Really, however, as Bu. remarks, the v. forms a forcible and poetical climax to vv.[18-21], though he admits that in parts it is over-full: he would thus read ארץ עיפתה ולא סדרים ותפע כמו אפל: the comparison of one kind of darkness with another (עפתה כמו אפל) is not natural; and he supposes that a scribe's eye passed from עפתה to ותפע, and he accordingly wrote by mistake the two following words כמו אפל, and then, as ולא סדרים was too short for the next clause, prefixed to it צלמות. The closing tristich is effective; but the repetition of כמו אפל cannot be called an elegancy.

CHAPTER XI.

2. הֲרֹב דברים] 𝔊 ὁ τὰ πολλὰ λέγων, Σ ὁ πολύλαλος, 𝔗 דמסגי מילייא, 𝔙 qui multa loquitur, Saad. كثير الكلام, *i.e.* רַב ד׳. Either might be right; but the variety of 𝔐 is more pleasing.

3. יַחֲרִישׁוּ] the only place in which החריש means "to *make* silent"; hence as 𝔖 has, "Lo, on account of thy words (על מליך) the dead (!) are silent," Be. would read לְבַדֶּיךָ, and Du. (but only with "wohl") either this, or (better) מִבַּדֶּיךָ or על בדיך. But there is no reason why החריש, though it usually means to *show silence*, should not also have denoted *make silent*. 𝔊 strangely *εὐλογημένος γεννητὸς γυναικὸς ὀλιγόβιος*,—as though (Du.) מְבֹרָךְ (בָּרוּךְ) מְעַט ים יְלֻד אִשָּׁה!

וַתִּלְעַג] As Di. rightly remarks, וַ׳ can only express something that has actually taken place: so that EVV., "*Should* thy boastings . . . ?" is incorrect, and vv.$^{2.4}$ must be rendered, "Thy boastings *bring* men to silence," etc. If the words are to be taken as a question, we must read וְתִלְעַג (with וְתאמר in ^{4}); so Bu.

מַכְלִם] The Hif. written defectively, "as often in Job in pause (14^{9} 21^{10} 22^{29} 29^{18} 35^{16}") (Bu.). 𝔊 ὁ ἀντικρινόμενος = מֹכִיחַ. 𝔖 has a doublet, ܘܡܠܠ ܠܟ and ܘܡܟܣܣ ܠܟ. Hence Be.[T] מֹכִיחַ (cf. 32^{12}); Be.[K] either מֹכִיחֲךָ or פִּלֵּא לָךְ: but upon insufficient grounds.

4. לִקְחִי] 𝔊 Καθαρός εἰμι τοῖς ἔργοις, 𝔖 ܘܟܐܢܐܝܬ ܐܬܕܒܪܬ, rightly have I *behaved myself*, whence Be. Du. Ho. St., observing also that Job has never claimed that his "doctrine" is pure, and comparing ^{b}, would read לֶכְתִּי, *my walking* (behaviour). This may be right (see 9^{21} תם אני): the moral sense of לכתי would be apparent from 𝔐 (cf. Pr. 15^{21} ואיש תבונה יְיַשֶּׁר־לָכֶת; *Lex.* 234*b*).

בְּעֵינֶיךָ] in thy eyes, *i.e.* God's: see 10^{7}. 𝔊 ἐναντίον αὐτοῦ

= בעיניו; so Me. Be.; there is, however, no antecedent to the pron., and the imagined address to God is more forcible (cf. $10^{2ff.}$). Sgf. Du. בְּעֵינֶי; but Job claims more than this (10^{7}).

5. מי יתן אלוה דבר] the position of אלוה is very anomalous, and not really paralleled by לא נתן סיחון את ישראל עֲבֹר, Nu. 21^{23}, cf. 20^{21}, and לא האמין סיחון את ישראל עֲבֹר, Jg. 11^{20} (Kö. 414*g*, *h*); we should expect either דַּבֵּר אֱלוֹהַּ, lit. "the speaking of God" (cf. Ex. 16^{3} מי יתן מוּתֵנוּ וג׳, 2 S. 19^{1}) or מי יתן אֱלוֹהַּ יְדַבֵּר (cf. c. 14^{13} 6^{8}). ידבר would agree well with the foll. וְיִפתח (14^{13}).

6. כי כפלאים] so 𝔊 ὅτι διπλοῦς, 𝔙𝔗. But why should only "double" be mentioned (the paraphrase *manifold*, 𝔙 *multiplex*, being very doubtful)? Read כי פְלָאִים with Be.[T] Bu. Ch. (*EB.* 2471) (not כי כפלאים, as Me. Bi.[2] Du. Ho., for the secrets of God's wisdom *are* wonders, and not merely *like* wonders; the fact that they are "wonders" need not imply (Du.) that, if declared to him by God, they would be above man's comprehension), "that it is *marvellous* in effective counsel"; cf. Is. 28^{29} הִפְלִא עצה הגדיל תושיה, and עשה פלא of God often.

ודע] "so know!" the imper. with ו denoting a consequence expected with certainty (G–K. 110*i*; Dr. 65), though (Bu.) "וְתֵדַע would be clearer." 𝔊 καὶ τότε γνώσῃ, though it can hardly be inferred from this that the translators *read* וְתֵדַע (Me.).

כי יַשֶּׁה לך אלוה מֵעֲוֺנֶךָ] "causeth to be forgotten for thee (somewhat) of (מן, part.) thine iniquity," *i.e.* allows it to be unremembered, not brought up against thee. So Di. RVm.; cf. 𝔗 אַנְשֵׁי לָךְ. Bu. נָשָׁה, *hath forgotten.* 𝔊 ὅτι ἄξιά σοι ἀπέβη ἀπὸ Κυρίου ὧν ἡμάρτηκας, whence Bi.[1] כי יְשַׁוֶּה לך וג׳, "that he *makes equal*, *requites*, to thee"; with this, however, כעונך must be read (Bu.) for מעונך. Du. considers 𝔊 to express כי יְשֻׁוֶּה לך מֵאֱלוֹהַּ כַּעֲוֺנך, "that there came to thee from God what corresponded to thy iniquity" (lit. "that it was equalled to thee from God according to thy iniquity"), though on account of its artificiality he thinks it inferior to 𝔐: in either form, however, he regards the clause as a gloss, partly on account of its incompatibility with v.$^{18ff.}$, partly on account of its prosaic character. But the clause is in substance, whatever

its exact form may have originally been, the necessary denial of [4] (Bu.). For *ἄξιον* = שוה, cf. 33[27] ולא שָׁוָה לי (where see note), Pr. 3[15] 8[11], Est. 7[4].

7b. תמצא] The repetition of the same word has led to the suspicion that it is due to a scribe: see, however, 8[3] (Di.); and note that מצא does not each time express the same sense [cf. G. B. Gray, *Forms of Hebrew Poetry*, p. 154]. Be. Bu. תֵּצֵא; but "go out" is not suitable, nor does it equal "dringen" (Bu.). If a change is needed, תָּבֹא (Du.) is better, but תגע (Sgf.) best.

8. גבהי שמים] In 𝔐 an exclamation, *The heights of heaven! what canst thou do* (sc. to scale them)? Cf. 22[12] 𝔐 הלא אלוה גֹּבַהּ שׁ׳; and עִמְקֵי שאול, Pr. 9[18] (Bu.). 𝔊 ὑψηλὸς ὁ οὐρανός = (Du.) גְּבֹהִם שמים, which suggests either (Ol.) גָּבֹהַּ מִשָּׁמַיִם, or—as feminines follow—גְּבֹהָה משמים (Me. Sgf. Be. Du.; Di. also inclines; cf. 𝔙 excelsior caelo est). The fem. adjj. will refer to תכלית [not to חכמה—Di. Du. Peake]; the limits of the Almighty are in every direction unsearchable.

9. מִדָּה] as pointed, for מִדָּתָהּ: G–K. 91*e*, *end*; and see on 5[13]. But it is better to read מִדָּה as an adv. accus. (Ew. Di. Bu. etc.): cf. 15[10] כביר מאביך ימים, and G–K. 131*p*, *q*, *r* ("apposition in the wider sense" being a not very happy expression for the adv. accus.).

10. יחלף] Gr. יחתף (יחטף), *if he seizes* (9[12]), which suits ויסגיר even better than יחליף, and may well be right.

[אם יחליף ויסגיר ויקהיל ומי ישיבנו] 𝔊 ἐὰν δὲ καταστρέψῃ τὰ πάντα, τίς ἐρεῖ αὐτῷ, τί ἐποίησας; cp. 9[12] 𝔊. Be.[T (cf. K)] considers the v. to be patched up from Job's words in 9[11. 12] and interpolated here, as is 12[14] between vv.[7] and [8] in MS [Ken. 34]. He also denies to the v. rhythmical structure: and it is in fact necessary to stress the particle אם in order to obtain the rhythm 3 : 3. If, however, this could be tolerated, the structure of the v. would have some resemblance to Gn. 49[9], Nu. 23[28], on which see Gray, *Forms of Hebrew Poetry*, 79 f.]

ומי] The apod. introduced by ו (except in the case of a pf. with ו cons.) is rare, though instances occur, *e.g.* 14[7], Jos. 20[5], 2 Ch. 7[14] ואני (Dr. 124, 136; and *Obs.* 2).

11. ולא יתבונן] A circ. cl. = *without considering it.* [Some read לו for לא (note the variants in 13^{15}), *and to it he gives heed*, which, however, lays a rather unnecessary stress on לו. 𝔖 either did not read, or reading did not render, a negative—ܣܟܠܐ ܣܡܠܐ ܘܡܣܬܟܠ; but it is very unwise to claim, as Du. does, that 𝔊 (ἰδὼν δὲ ἄτοπα οὐ παρόψεται) read לו not לא. Ehrlich would read לא יתבוננו, *which they perceive not.*]

12. The following are the principal interpretations of this difficult verse:—

1. Di. Du. Volz:—

And so a hollow man getteth understanding,
And a wild ass's colt is born a man,

i.e. (as explained above), By the judgments of the All-wise, ignorance and conceit are removed, and an obstinate and intractable nature, like Job's, is tamed. ילבב only here; but, as לב = *understanding*, the rendering given is a natural one for it (so already Rashi and Ibn Ezra, יִקְנֶה לֵב: Qi. (*Lex.*) פֵּירוּשׁ האדם נבוב וְחָלוּל בַּתְּחִלָּה בְּאֵין דֵּעָה ואחר כך ילבב שיש לו לבב ודעת).

2. De.[1] Kamph. Studer, and (substantially) RVm.:—

But a hollow man getteth understanding,
And (= as little as) a wild ass's colt is born a man:

and expressing a comparison, as 5^7 (where see n.). But this rendering represents Job as incorrigible, and is inconsistent with v.[13ff.], in which Zophar sets himself to reform Job.

3. Hi. De.[2]:—

But (even) a hollow man may get understanding,
And a wild ass's colt be born a man.

None need be despaired of: even the least intelligent, just as Job, may get wisdom, and the most intractable may be tamed.

4. Bu. (with יְלֻמַּד for אָדָם לֵד):—

But a hollow man may get understanding,
And a wild ass's colt may let itself be tamed:

נלמד, be *taught*, or, of an animal, be *trained* or *tamed*, as Hos. 10[11] עֶגְלָה מְלֻמָּדָה. Older scholars regarded the Nif. ילבב as *privative*: so Ges. (*Thes.* 738*a*) "*Sed homo cavus* est et *mente caret*, *et* instar *pulli onagri homo nascitur.* Significatur imbecillitas et stupor ingenii humani cum divina sapientia comparati." RV. "But vain man is void of understanding, Yea, man is born (as) a wild ass's colt." But though the Pi. is so used as to acquire a privative sense (Ew. § 120*e*; G–K. 52*h*), there is no evidence that the Nif. ever acquired it.

עיר פרא] appos., "a foal, a wild ass," עיר denoting the genus, and פרא the species, like נערה בתולה, "a girl, a virgin"; G–K. 131*b* (but 131*c*, *n*. עיר is treated as a *st. c.*).

אדם יולד] may be born a man,—אדם accus. of the product (G–K. 121*d*; cf. on 15[7]).

13. הכינות] 𝔊 *καθαρὰν ἔθου* = חִזַּכְתָּ.

ופרשׂת] the pf. and וְ cons., carrying on the hypoth. אם . . . הכינות; see on 9[30].

14. The v., as it stands, must be parenthetical (cf. 8[6a], Di.), [15] being the apod. to [13]. Du., arguing that such an important condition for a prayer to be accepted would not appear in a parenth. clause, would read אם־און מִיָּדְךָ הִרְחִיק ולא תּ׳, "If naughtiness keeps far (הרחיק intr. as Gn. 44[4] al.) from thy hand, And iniquity dwelleth (*v.i.*) not in thy tent": but the exhortation that Job should himself put iniquity from him, is both more forcible and more what would be expected.

תַּשְׁכֵּן] 𝔊 (*μὴ αὐλισθήτω*), 'ΑΘΣ𝔙, Du. Be. תִּשְׁכֹּן: weaker and unnecessary.

אהליך] so always (for 'אֹהָ) in the pl. before light suffixes: G–K. 93*r*. But 𝔊𝔖𝔗 'ΑΣΘ𝔙, Saad., and 40 MSS אָהֳלֶךָ (Ps. 61[5]), which is perhaps preferable (cf. the sg. in 5[24] 19[12] 22[23] 29[4] 31[31]).

15. כי אז] *indeed, then*, as כי עתה, 8[6]: cf. Dr. 142; and for כי אז in the apod., though in a different case, after a protasis introduced by לו, 2 S. 2[27] 19[7] (Dr. 139).

מִמּוּם] *away from* (= *without*) *spot*: מן, *away from*, as 28[4], Nu. 15[24] al. (*Lex.* 578*a*, b); and = *without*, as 19[26] 21[9], Pr. 1[33]

(*ib.*). 𝕲 ὥσπερ ὕδωρ καθαρόν = כמים, supposed by Bi. Be. to have crept in here from v.[16b]; ממום, representing it, is consequently deleted by them.

מֻצָּק] *firmly established*, Hof. ptcp. of יָצַק: in many edd. מֻצָּק; cf. G–K. 71. יָצַק is to *pour out*; but the word is often used of the *casting* of metals; and hence, in the pass. ptcp. and some derivatives, it appears to have acquired the sense of *firm*: cf. 37^{18} חֲזָקִים כִּרְאִי מוּצָק, "strong as a *molten* (i.e. *firmly cast*) mirror," $41^{15.16}$ יָצוּק; 38^{38} בְּצֶקֶת עָפָר לַמּוּצָק, "when the dust floweth into *compactness*"; 1 S. 2^{8} מְצוּק (in מְצֻקֵי ארץ), a *cast* (metal column) = *strong support*. Me. Wr. והיית מֻזָּק, and thou shalt be *purified* (זקק, Mal. 3^{3}: cf. on 28^{1}); cf. 𝕿 סְנֵן מִתְפַּגְּלָא (סְנֵן, for זקק 28^{1}, Ps. 12^{7}); but this does not suit well with ולא תירא. Bi., cleverly, וְהָיְתָה מְצֻקָה, "and if distress (15^{24}) comes, thou wilt not fear"; Be. וְהָיִיתָ בְּצוֹק (Dn. 9^{25} †) or והיית מוּצָק = "and if thou art *in distress* (or *distressed*: Hof. ptcp. of צוק, cf. the Hif. Is. 51^{13} הַמֵּצִיק), thou wilt not fear." But in the sequel (vv.[16–19]) no *recurrence* of trouble is contemplated. Bu. Du. are both satisfied with 𝕸,—Du. merely adding that any one stumbling at מֻצָּק might perhaps read better והיית מֻצָּק. But this would be poor and doubtful Heb. for "be *free from* distress."

16. כי אתה עמל תשכח] on the order (subj. obj. verb), of which there are many examples (*e.g.* Gn. 17^{9}, Ps. 10^{14} 56^{7}), see Dr. 208. 3; G–K. 142 f., *c*. 𝕾 ܗܫܐ for כי אתה, whence Me. Bi. Hfm. Sgf. Be. Bu. Du. would read עַתָּה for אתה. But עתה is expressed by ܗܫܐ (*v.* עתה in Job, *passim*): ܗܫܐ corresponds to אַז (v.[15] 9^{31} 13^{20} etc.). אתה and עתה are sometimes confused; and we may, if we please, read עתה *without* the support of 𝕾; but the change is unnecessary; a slight emph. on the pron. is not at all out of place.

כְּמַיִם] not כַּמַּיִם, the term being defined by the foll. rel. clause (*Lex*. ח, 1, f).

17. מצהרים] more (brightly) than the noon, the attribute compared being left to be understood (G–K. 133*e*); cf. Ps. 4^{8}, Is. 10^{10}. חלד alone is as bald in Heb. as it would be in English

(EVV. have to supply "thy" in italics): rd. חֶלְדְּךָ. 𝔊 ἐκ δὲ μεσημβρίας ἀνατελεῖ σοι ζωή (not apparently *reading*, but supplying, the pron.),—a beautiful image, but hardly that of the Heb.

חלד] prop. *duration*; and so *time*, *age*, with the collat. idea of *transient*: Ps. 17[14] 39[6] 49[2] 89[48] (but rd. prob. מֶה חָדֶל), + Jb. 10[20] (*vid. n.*), Is. 38[11] עם יושבי חָדֶל (rd. חָלֶד; cf. Ps. 49[2]) †. An interesting word. The √ does not occur in Heb.; but the Arab. خلد, to *abide* or *continue perpetually*, is very common, oft. in Qor. in the expression خالدين فيها, *abiding* in them (the gardens of Paradise) *continually* (Qor. 3[13. 130. 197] etc.), and خلد *eternity*, = *eternal life*, Qor. 21[35], punishment of *eternity*, 32[14]. The √, signifying properly to *continue*, *endure*, has thus in the two languages acquired different nuances: in Arab. it denotes *eternal* duration, in Heb., of human life, *transient* duration. EVV. Ps. 17[14] 49[2] *world* (*i.e.* "world" in the sense of *time*, *αἰών*, as in "world without end"), of the (fleeting) age, or existence (Ps. 49[2] "ye that *dwell* in חלד"), of human life.

תָּעֻפָה] 3 fem. sg. cohort. (the *fem.*, as 10[22]: G–K. 144*c*), forming, with תהיה, on the analogy of the double jussive (Dr. 152. 3), a condit. sentence. It is true, the coh. is not so used elsewhere; and the *third* pers. in the coh. is of rare occurrence (Dr. 45 *n.*; G–K. 48*d*); but, though 𝔖𝔗 express a subst., and many moderns accordingly read תְּעֻפָה (of the same form as תְּבוּאָה, תְּרוּמָה, etc.), the hypoth. sense which seems to be intended, is expressed better by 𝔐 (so Ew. *Lb.* § 357*b*; Del. Di. Bu.).

18. וּבָטַחְתָּ] The *tiphā* is prepositive; but the metheg, marking the countertone, shows that the pf. is *milra'*, and that the וְ is consequently the ו consec. So וְרָבַצְתָּ, v.[19].

כי יש תקוה] So Pr. 19[18], Ru. 1[12]: cf. c. 14[7].

וחפרת לבטח תשכב] Dr. 162, 163, with *Obs.* In Heb., esp. in poetry, two verbs are not unfrequently put ἀσυνδέτως, where we should use a prep., or *so that*, to bring out the relation between them: cf. 31[34] וָאִדֹּם לא אצא פתח, not *going out* to the gate; Ps. 50[20] תֵּשֵׁב באחיך תְּדַבֵּר; Nu. 14[3] *so that* or *while* our children will become a prey, 1 S. 18[5] וַיֵּצֵא דוד . . . ישכיל,

doing wisely; Is. 3[26] וְנִקָּתָה לָאָרֶץ תֵּשֵׁב, and she shall be emptied, *sitting* on the ground, 29[4] וְשָׁפַלְתְּ מֵאֶרֶץ תְּדַבֵּרִי, 27[9] לֹא יָקֻמוּ, 60[11] לֹא יִסָּגֵרוּ: cf. on c. 30[28].—𝔊 for [b] has *ἐκ δὲ μερίμνης καὶ φροντίδος ἀναφανεῖταί σοι εἰρήνη*, as though (Du.) they read מֵחֲרָדָה וּמִשִּׂחַ תִּשְׁלָם; which Du., keeping, however, תִּשְׁכַּב, would adopt ("*without* care (?) and complaint thou wilt lie down"); but the sense of מן is dub. (v.[15a] is different), and no change is necessary.

20. מְנֻחָם] only here: cf. Aram. מִנְּהוֹן (Dn. 2[23]); and מִנְהוּ, 4[12] †. See, further, G–K. 103*m*. After v.[20c] 𝔊[A] adds *παρ' αὐτῷ γὰρ σοφία καὶ δύναμις* = עִמּוֹ חָכְמָה וּגְבוּרָה (12[13]), which Me. Be.[1] oddly adopt here.

CHAPTER XII.

2. אמנם כי] cf. חָבִי, 6[22]; הֲלֹא כִּי, 2 S. 13[28]; אף כי, 1 S. 8[9] (*Lex.* 472*a*).

אתם עם] ye are *people*, a strange statement. Du. הָעָם, which is the least change that will suffice; Bi. עַם נָבוֹן; Be. עֲרֻמִּים for עם (cf. Pr. 8[12] עָרְמָה in a good sense, ‖ חָכְמָה); Gr. חֲכָמִים; Klo. הַיֹּד[ְ]עִם], *they that know* (cf. 34[2]), an excellent ‖ to [b] חכמה.

3. לא נפל אנכי מכם] it is strange to find the same words in 13[2b], in the same speech. It is needed there to complete the couplet, while here it is not required. It is probably a gloss suggested by 13[2], written here originally on the margin, which afterwards found its way into the text (so Me. Bi. Di. Sgf. Be. Du.). But 𝔊 is not evidence of the omission, except for those who omit [3c. 4a. b] as well; for 𝔊 omits these lines also.

4. 𝔊 (omitting [a. b], perhaps by ὁμοιοτ.) *δίκαιος γὰρ ἀνὴρ καὶ ἄμεμπτος ἐγενήθη εἰς χλευασμόν* (obviously a rendering of [c], שחוק צדיק תמים, from which nothing can be inferred as to 𝔊's reading of [a. b]); so Me. 𝔖 ܘܗܘܐ ܓܘܚܟܐ ܠܚܒܪܘܗܝ ܩܪܐ ܠܐܠܗܐ ܘܥܢܐ ܠܗ ܙܕܝܩܐ ܘܬܡܝܡܐ ܠܐ ܡܬܟܣܐ. Sgf. for [4] reads שְׂחֹק שחֹק לרעהו (לְרָעִים or ?) קֹרֵא לֶאֱלוֹהַּ. Be.[T] לְמֵרֵעַ אהיה שחוק צדיק וְתָמִים (לפחד, from [5] לפיד) צדיק וְתָמִים לְפַחַד; Be.[K] יהיה for אהיה, with 𝔊 (?; *v. supr.*), 𝔖, and for [c] לְפִיד שחוק צדיק וְתמים (לפיד *for calamity*, from [5]). Du. שחק לרעהו יִהְיֶה קֹרֵא לאלוה ויענהו שחוק איש צדיק. Gr. for [a] הַשְּׂחֹק לרעהו יִהְיֶה. Bi.[2] *m.c.* has to reduce [3–4] to a single couplet, גם לי לבב כמכם צַדִּיקָה תְמִמָה לְכֻתִּי, quoting 𝔊 (!), as support for צ' ת' ל' (לכתי from [5] לפיד). All these changes and omissions are arbitrary. Against Be.[K] Du. Gr. it is to be remarked that קֹרֵא לאלוה ויענהו makes a heavy subject for יהיה: 𝔐 (so Bu.) is much better, "(One that is) a mockery to his

friend I am to be (see on 9^{20}), A caller unto God (in Eng. (A man) that called) unto God, and He answered him; the just, the perfect man is a mockery!" In the Heb. the changes of person, and the ellipses which have to be supposed in Eng., are not felt: cf. 18^{4a}, Is. 22^{16} (מה לך . . . קברו), 47^{8} 48^{1} 54^{1} רָנִּי עֲקָרָה לֹא יָלָדָה, "Shout, O barren one, she (that) hath not borne," Jer. $49^{4b.16}$, 2 K. 9^{31}, Mic. 1^{2} = 1 K. 22^{28}, Mal. 3^{9} (G–K. 144*p*, Eng. tr.).

5. Rendered usually (*e.g.* by De. Da.): "For calamity there is contempt according to the thinking of the prosperous, (It is) ready for those whose foot slippeth": so substantially Ew. Di. Bu., though, thinking that a subst. would be a better parallel to בוז, they treat נכון as one (from נָכָה, הִכָּה,—though not found elsewhere), and render [b], "And a *stroke* for those whose foot slippeth." פיד, as 30^{24} 31^{29}, Pr. 24^{22}. עשתות from √ עשת, to *think*, common in Aram. (Dn. 6^{4}; אתעשת, Hos. 10^{18} 𝕿 al.; in Heb. יתעשת, Jon. 1^{6} †, and עֶשְׁתֹּנֹת, *thoughts*, Ps. 146^{4} †, cf. 𝕿 (עֶשְׁתּוֹנִין, Is. 41^{29} 55^{7} al.). עשתות, in view of the meaning of עשת, is a suspicious form; but the change to עֶשְׁתֹּנֹת would be very slight. 𝕲 freely, εἰς χρόνον γὰρ τακτὸν ἡτοίμαστο πεσεῖν ὑπ' ἄλλων, taking no account of לפיד בוז, and in χρ. τ. apparently thinking of לְעִתּוֹת for לעשתות: hence Bi., cleverly, בַּז לְעִתּוֹת שַׁדַּי שַׁאֲנָן נכון למוֹעד רגלו (so Be., only omitting שדי), "The prosperous despiseth the Almighty's time (of judgment: cf. 24^{1}), At the appointed time (cf. Ps. 75^{3}) *his* foot stands firm" (he does not dread it). Du. תַּמִּים הָיוּ לְפִיד בַּז לְעִתּוֹת שַׁאֲנָן נכון למועד רגלו (תמים from ^{4c}), The perfect come to calamity, The prosperous despiseth times of destiny (foretold by prophets or apocalyptists: cf. 1 Ch. 12^{32}, Est. 1^{13}), For the appointed time his foot stands firm."

6. ישליו] G–K. 29*t*, 75*u*. The form יִשְׁלָיוּ is, however, not necessarily (Be.) a *pausal* form (see, *e.g.*, Is. 21^{12} תִּבְעָיוּן, 56^{12} אֵתָיוּ, Jer. 12^{9} הֵתָיוּ), and it may (against G–K.) begin a sentence (Ps. 68^{32} יֶאֱתָיוּ; and at least after ◌ָ, Ps. 122^{6} יִשְׁלָיוּ). As the text stands, אהלים לשדדים will be poet. for אהלי שדדים (*Lex.* 513*b*; Ps. 37^{16} 58^{6} 105^{36} 116^{15} 123^{4b}); but Sgf. Bu. שְׁלוֹם אהלים לשׁ׳, though not in itself necessary, has the advantage of making [a]

and ^{b} uniform in construction. Be. supposes אֹהָלִים to be a tendentious correction of אֱלֹהִים, and would read שָׁלוֹם לְשֹׁדְדֵי אֱלֹהִים, "wohl geht es denen die Gott trotzen"; but שדד is to *spoil*, *devastate*, which is much more than *trotzen*, and not a word likely to have been used with God as an object.

בַּטֻּחוֹת] only here: the pl. with an intensive force: G–K. 124*a*, *e*; for the form, see Kö. ii. 201.

לַאֲשֶׁר וגו׳] Sgf. לאשר הביא באלוה ידו (so Be.^{T}; Be.^{K} הֵנִיף for הביא), "hath brought (*or* swung) his hand against God." Du. לֵאמֹר הֲכִי אלוה בידי, "Who saith, Is not God in my hand?" but *is not* is הלא (Gn. 27^{36} is different); and this is merely the sense expressed by 𝔐 without emendation.

7a. ותרך] prob. from ^{8a}. Read with 𝔊 Du. ותאמר לך, the fem. sg. by G–K. 145*k*. Me. Bu. om., as introduced by error from ^{8a}.

8. או שיח לארץ] שיח is usually *to muse*, with collat. idea of *complain* (*v.* on 7^{11}); poet. for *talk*, Jg. 5^{10}, Ps. 69^{13} 105^2, Pr. 6^{22}. But in view of $^{7a. 8b}$ a syn. of רֶמֶשׂ is greatly desiderated. Rd. either (Be.^{K} Du.) או זֹחֲלֵי ארץ (Mic. 7^{17}, Dt. 32^{24} (זֹחֲלֵי עָפָר), or (Hi. Sgf.) או שֶׁרֶץ הארץ, or (Kautzsch, Bu.) חַיַּת הארץ (cf. Ew. *Lehre der Bibel* (1874), iii. 13; Di. (keeping שיח), או שִׂיחַ לְחַיַּת הארץ).

8b, 9 in 𝔊 are from Θ. Be. would omit them; but he does not explain what the antecedent to אשר in v.^{10} would be.

9. עָשְׂתָה זאת] G–K. 20*c*.

יהוה] 7 MSS אלוה.

11. Form of comparison, as 5^7.

יטעם לו] the reflexive לְ: 5^{27} 13^1.

12. בישישים] יָשִׁישׁ, 15^{10} 29^8 32^6 †; יָשֵׁשׁ, 2 Ch. 36^{17} †. Du., cleverly, but needlessly (for the sense comes to the same as when 𝔐 is taken, as by Hi. Bu. RVm., as a quotation of the opinion of friends), הֲכִי שָׁנִים.

13. עצה] Bu. "עֹצֶם (30^{21}), or rhythmically better, and graphically easier, עָצְמָה (Is. 40^{29})."

14. . . . ולא . . . לא] 𝔊𝔖: . . . וּמִי יִבְנֶה . . . וּמִי יְפַתֵּחַ (𝔙 "nemo est qui . . . nullus est qui . . ."); but 𝔐 is equally probable. Bi. Be. Du. suppose that originally the clauses

varied, and that they were assimilated by 𝔐 and 𝔊𝔖 differently; but if so, ומי, as the more rhetorical and forcible expression, should stand in [b].

15. עצר ב׳] as 4[2].

ויבשו] 𝔊 ἐξήρανεν τὴν γῆν: Du. Be.[K] וְיַבֵּשׁ; but an obj. expressed is desiderated. Of course the waters held back are not these which are dried up: but all that the poet means is that, when there is a flood, if the supply of water ceases, the water forming the flood quickly evaporates or otherwise disappears.

16. תושיה] 5^{12} n.

[שגג ומשגה] in one MS [Ken.] 245 שונה ומ׳. A proverbial expression for *all*, *every one*: cf. עצור ועזוב (Dt. 32^{36} with Dr.'s n.), הרוה את הצמאה, Dt. 29^{18}, and, perhaps, ער וענה (Mal. 2^{12} with Dr.'s n.). Still closer to the form of phrase used here are the Arabic phrases المسمع والسامع (which would be equivalent in Hebrew to המשמיע והשומע) and الشاهد والمشهود عليه (cited with some other examples in Ges. *Thes*. p. 1362*a*), in the light of which the proposal to read משגהו for משגה is not only unnecessary, but improbable. Nor is Ehrlich's וּמְשֻׁגָּה, "every one that errs and every *error*," acceptable.]

17. שולל] v.[19], Mic. 1^8 †. The sg. construed with a pl., as עָרוֹם וְיָחֵף, Is. 20^4; עָרוֹם, c. $24^{7.10}$. The adj. in all such cases is syntactically in the accus., defining the state (Dr. 161. 2 *n.*; G–K. 118*o*): usually the adj. agrees with the noun, but in the cases quoted it remains sing., lit. (as) *one stripped*, *naked*, etc. (The Syr. ܫܠܝܚ (24^{10}), *naked*, is indeclinable: Kö. 332*h*; PS. 2989; Nöld. *Syr. Gr.* § 244.)

מוליך יועצים שולל] As Du. remarks, this is suspiciously like [19a]; שֹׁבָל (סְבַל) is a better ∥ to יהולל than שולל (see esp. Is. 44^{25}), and 𝔊[A] has יועצי ארץ for יועצים: hence Du. would read יועצי ארץ יְסַבֵּל. Clever, and (Bu.) "sehr erwägenswert."

ו׳ . . . יהולל] G–K. 116*x*; Dr. 117.

18. מוסר] מוּסָר is *discipline*, but only *moral* discipline, not the constraint, or authority, exercised by a king. Rd. there-

fore מֹוסֵר (cf. 𝔗 שושילתא, 𝔙 balteum), *bond* (from √ אָסַר),—otherwise only in the pl., which indeed would here be an improvement (מֹוסְרֵי); and cf. 39[5] וּמֹסְרוֹת ערוד מי פִּתַּח; Ps. 116[16]. So Di. Bu. Du. etc.

ויאסר] אסר in the sense *gird* (Neh. 4[12] †) is an Aramaic usage (W. R. S.); cf. in 𝔖 Ex. 12[11], Jer. 1[17], 2 K 3[21]; and PS. 321 ܐܣܰܪ (3), 322 ܐܣܳܪ (2), ܐܣܰܪ (2).

אֵזוֹר] Not a "girdle," such as was worn *above* the robes, but (W. R. Smith, *JQR.*, 1892, 289 ff.; *EB.* 1734), a *loin-cloth*, worn round the loins, and tied with a knot, and worn as an *under*-garment, next the skin (Jer. 13[1. 11], Is. 11[5]), or, it might be, as the only garment. It is mentioned in the OT. as worn by warriors (Is. 5[27]; cf. the illustr. in Rawlinson, *Anc. Monarchies*, i. 430, of two Ass. warriors, wearing a broad-patterned loin-cloth round their otherwise naked bodies), a prophet,—as a mark of primitive simplicity (2 K. 1[8]): *v.* further *Lex.* Here the אזור, as the *only* garment worn, is the badge of a captive or slave (a mark of the king's limitation). Gr. Du. Ho. Be. St. אֵסוּר, *bands* (Jg. 15[14]); but if W. R. Smith's explanation is correct, no change is needed.

19. מוליך] in loose appos. to the sf. in עִמּוֹ; cf. 25[2] 26[7-9]. This is better than to regard it as an accus. of state (Gn. 3[8] etc., 1 K. 14[6]; Dr. 161, *Obs.* 2; G–K. 118*p*).

איתנים] *firmly established*: "mighty" (EVV.) is a mere *quid pro quo.* איתן (in form an "elative," like the opp. אַכְזָב: G–K. 85*b*, 133*a*, n.) is another word (cf. on 9[26]), the proper sense of which was lost by the Jews, and only recovered when Arabic began to be compared systematically with Hebrew, some 300 years ago. The renderings *mighty*, *strong*, *strength* are in reality only guesses made from the context, found sometimes in the ancient versions, and adopted generally by the mediæval Jews, whom the translators of AV. often followed as their guide. But the Arab. *watana*, as Schultens showed (*Origg. Hebrææ*, 1724, I. 8, ed. 2, 1761, p. 112 ff.), means to *be constant*, *permanent*, *unfailing*, esp. of water, but also of other things, as the ptcp. *wātin* of a *constant* friend (p. 110). This explains

the Heb. usage: thus נחל איתן, a *perennial*, *ever-flowing*, wady (Am. 5^{24}, Dt. 21^{4}); *permanent*, *enduring*, of a bow (Gn. 49^{24}); of a secure, impregnable dwelling, Nu. 24^{21} (‖ שים בסלע), Jer. 49^{19}; of a nation, whose numbers never dwindle or fail, *imperishable*, Jer. 5^{15}; and here of men *firmly seated*, or *established*, in positions of dignity (*v.* further *Lex.*).

וַיְסַלֵּף] סִלֵּף, Ex. 23^{8} = Dt. 16^{19} וִיסַלֵּף דברי צדיקים (of a bribe), Pr. 13^{6} 19^{3} אִוֶּלֶת אדם תְּסַלֵּף דרכו, 21^{12} 22^{12} † סֶלֶף, Pr. 11^{3} 15^{4} †. The √ idea seems to be to *be crooked*; and so in Pi. to *pervert*, *subvert*, or *upset* (see *Thes.*; and Del. on Pr. 11^{3},—much fuller than Toy). Arab. *salafa* is to *go before*, *precede* (Lane, 1407 f.), which does not help us. Levy cites two passages from 𝔗, Pr. 10^{10} (סַלִיף, *one who is crooked* with his lips = Heb. אֱוִיל), and Est. 𝔗^{II} 6^{10} פומיה אסתליף, the mouth *verdrehte sich*.

20. מסיר שפה ל'] ל after a vb. of removing is strange: but it can only mean *with regard to*: so Ps. 40^{11} 84^{12}.

21. מְזִיחַ †] מֵזַח, Is. 23^{10}, Ps. 109^{19} †.

אפיקים] אפיק is elsewhere a *channel*, esp. of a stream (6^{15} al.), or *tube* (poet. of a bone), 40^{18} (see also on 41^{7}),—apparently something that *restrains*, or *confines* (cf. התאפק, to *restrain* oneself); but from this a sense such as *mighty* can be obtained only artificially (Di. "*der viel Umfassende*, hier speciell der an Kraft Vielvermögende, Gewaltige"). Read either (Bu.) אַמִּיצִים, *the strong* (9^{19}, Is. 28^{2} al.), or (Du.) אַבִּירִים, *the mighty* (24^{22} 34^{20}), or (Be.) תַּקִּיפִים, *the strong* (Aram., Dan. 2^{40} etc.; otherwise in Heb. only Qoh. 6^{10}: the vb. תָּקַף, however, in 14^{20}).

23. משגיא] *increasing*; see on 8^{7}. '𝔄Θ𝔖 and 7 MSS מַשְׁנֶה=משניא (v.^{16}), causing to err, *misleading* (so Me. Sgf.; the ל, after a Hif., as Gn. 9^{27} יַפְתְּ א' לְיפת (*Lex.* 511*b*, c).

לגוים (2)] the ל, as 5^{2}. But 5 MSS לְאֻמִּים, which may be right [cf. 8^{3} n.].

וַיַּנְחֵם] *and leads them away* (Di. De.); but this is doubtfully supported by 2 K. 18^{11} (read rather here, with Hi., וַיַּנִּחֵם בחלח וג', "and *set* them in Ḥalaḥ," etc.; and so 1 K. 10^{26}): הִנְחָה is everywhere else used in a good sense. Read וַיַּנִּחֵם, though not (Hi.) in the sense of *settleth them* (which would need the *place* to be specified, as Is. 14^{1} וְהִנִּיחָם על אדמתם, besides being unsuited to

the context), but in that of *leaveth them*, *forsaketh them* (|| [a] ויאבדם), which is the sense of הִנִּיחַ, when used absolutely, as Jg. 16[26], Jer. 14[9] אַל תַּנִּחֵנִי (so Wr.).

24. עַם] om. 𝔊 Bi. Lag. Du.

תהו לא דרך] = a *pathless waste* (Dr. 164; G–K. 152*u*); cf. 26[2] 38[26] להמטיר על ארץ לא איש, 2 S. 23[4] בקר לא עבות, a *cloudless* morning, Ps. 88[5] כגבר אֵין אֱיָל.

25. ימששו חשך] *they feel darkness* (not, grope *in* darkness); משש sq. acc., as Gn. 31[34] and Laban *felt about* all the tent (sq. ב, 25[14], Dt. 28[29]).

ולא אור] חשך is sometimes strengthened by the addition of ולא אור (Am. 5[18. 20], La. 3[2]): so the meaning might be simply "they feel darkness, and not light." לא abs. sometimes denies Gn. 29[7], Nu. 20[5], Is. 44[19], Jer. 5[12] (*Lex.* 519*a*, b, *b*), so the words (as a circ. cl.) might be rendered *and there is no light*, like 22[16] וְלֹא עת (but many MSS here בְּלֹא), וְאֵין מִסְפָּר, Ps. 104[25] 105[34]; but לא alone, as [24], would be better then (so Sgf. Du. Be.[K] Bu.), cf. (after a vb.) c. 34[24].

ויתעם] 𝔊 πλανηθείησαν δέ, whence Bi. Du. Bu. (in note) וַיִּתָּעוּ (Nif.: cf. Is. 19[14] כְּהִתָּעוֹת שִׁכּוֹר), avoiding the repetition from [24b], securing the same subj. as in [a], and making the line somewhat fuller.

CHAPTER XIII.

1. כל] *i.e.* (Di. Du.) everything relating to God's rule of the world, and pertinent to the present subject. 𝔊 Bi. אֵלֶּה; but this is weak. 12 MSS, 𝔊[253] 𝔖𝔙 כל־אֵלֶּה; but "these things" is probably an addition (like *this* in EVV.), intended to limit "all" needlessly to what has just been said.

לה] the reflex. ל, as 12^{11}.

3. אולם אני] as 5^{8}.

הוכח] inf. abs., as 9^{18}: G–K. 113*d* (not inf. c., 53*k*, with a ?).

4. ואולם אתם] strongly emphasizing the contrast between God and Job's friends. 𝔊 Bi. Be. Du. St. ואתם; Me. Sgf. אתם alone. ואתם is more idiomatic than אתם; but it is decidedly weaker than ואולם אתם.

טפלי] *plasterers of.* טפל (14^{17}, Ps. 119^{69} †) is in Syr. (rare) to *foul*; in Talm. (Levy) to *smear* or *daub*; in Jer. 43^{9} 𝔗 טפיל is *mortar*; תָּפֵל, *plaster, whitewash*, Ezk. $13^{10.\,11.\,14.\,15}$ 22^{28} is also evidently the same word. 𝔊 freely ἰατροὶ ἄδικοι.

אֱלִל] *worthlessness*, (cf. Syr. ܐܠܝܠܐ, *weak, feeble, poor*; perhaps also in usage felt to suggest אַל); so Zec. 11^{17} רֹעִי האליל, a *worthless* shepherd, Jer. 14^{14} (rd. קסם אליל), a *worthless* divination: usually in pl. of *worthless gods* or *idols*.

6. תוכחתי] 𝔊 ἔλεγχον τοῦ στόματός μου = תוכחת פִּי, prob. rightly (Me. Bi. Wr. Di. Bu. al.).

7, 8. Notice the emphatic position of הלאל, ולו, הפניו, and לאל before the verb.

תדברו . . . תדברו] 𝔊 λαλεῖτε . . . φθέγγεσθε [against the repetition in 𝔐, see 8^{3} n.]. φθ. [nowhere else in 𝔊 of OT., nor anywhere in 'ΑΘΣ, renders דבר, for which cf. only Sir. 13^{22}, but it is] = הִבִּיעַ, Ps. 78^{2} 94^{4}; and in view of ª, תַּבִּיעוּ may be right (Be. Du.). הִבִּיעַ is a poet. syn. of דִּבֶּר, implying

a *flow* of speech; and used in both a good (Ps. 119[171] תַּבַּעְנָה שפתי תהלה) and a bad sense (Pr. 15[2] ופי כסילים יביע אולת).

9. כְּהָתֵל באנוש תְּהָתֵלּוּ] הֵתֵל (Gn. 31[7], Ex. 8[25], Jg. 16[10. 13. 15] †; Hof. הוּתַל; Is. 44[20] †) is Hif. of תלל*; of this תְּהָתֵלּוּ, and (less correctly) יְהָתֵלּוּ, Jer. 9[4] †, are, as pointed, Hif. with the ה anomalously retained (G–K. 53*q*). But 1 K 18[27] we have a Pi. וַיְהַתֵּל †, in 17[2] the subst. הֲתֻלִּים †, and Is. 30[10] מַהֲתַלּוֹת †, which show that Heb. must have had a secondary verb הָתַל formed from הֵתֵל; and in all probability the Pi. תְּהַתְּלוּ, יְהַתְּלוּ should be read here and Jer. 9[4] (see Stade, § 145*e*).

10. פנים] Σ 𝔖𝔗𝔙, *his face* (so Me. Sgf. Gr. Be. Du.): the rendering, however, is not evidence that these translators *read* פניו; nor is the change necessary.

11. שְׂאֵת] cf. 31[23], Gn. 49[3], Hab. 1[7], Ps. 62[5] (not in all with quite the same *nuance*).

12. זכרניכם] זכרון is both a *memorial* (Ex. 12[14] al.), or thing calling something else to remembrance, and a *memorandum*, or thing worthy itself of remembrance (Ex. 17[14] כְּתֹב זאת זכרון בספר, al.): in Est. 6[1] ספר זִכְרֹנוֹת, book of things worthy of remembrance, as records; here, things worthy of remembrance, as *dicta* to be appealed to, common-places, apophthegms, stock instances.

לגבי חמר גביכם] = "*become* bosses of clay," the ל, as often, denoting *transition into* (*Lex.* ל 4), usually with a verb, as שׂם, נתן, היה, etc., but occasionally in poet. and late Heb. without one (*ib.* 512*b*), as Mic. 1[14] בתי אכזיב לְאַכְזָב, Hab. 1[11] זו כחו לֵאלֹהוֹ, Zec. 4[7], La. 4[3].

גביכם] גב is prop. the *back* (Ps. 129[3]), then the back, *i.e.* the boss or "buckle," of a shield (15[26]), and hence Ges. *Thes. propugnaculum*, *arx*, comparing Arab. ظهر, *back* (also used of the *back* of a shield), in the same sense, as Hariri, *Cons.*, p. 85, de Sacy, "ut corroboretur *dorsum* eius in litigando, *i.e.* validum præsidium habeat." Perhaps, however, Du. Bu. are right in giving גב here the more obvious sense which it has in 15[26], the *boss* of a shield, fig. for *defence*.

13. החרישו ממני] the opp. החרישו אֵלַי, Is. 41[1]; cf. Ps. 28[1], 1 S. 7[8].

אני] note the emph. position; cf. Jg. 8^{23}, 2 S. 12^{28} 17^{15}, Jer. 17^{18} 21^{5} (Dr., *Tenses*, p. 202).

מה] idiom. for our "what will" (lit. *somewhat, aught*, 1 S. 19^{3} al.; *Lex.* 553*b*, 3); cf. 2 S. 18^{22} וִיהִי־מָה אָרֻצָה־נָּא גַם אָנִי, [23] וִיהִי־מָה ארוץ. Bi. Du. Klo., taking back על מה from [14], ויעבר עלי מה על מה, "Und komme über mich *was und was!*" lit. *was zu was*; cf. Ezk. 7^{26} הֹוָה עַל הֹוָה, Jer. 4^{20}. The proposal is clever but venturesome.

14. על־מה וג׳] Why should I take my flesh in my teeth, and put my life in my hand? This, understood in the natural sense of the idiom in [b], would mean, Why should I hazard, or *imperil*, my life (see Jg. 12^{3}, 1 S. 19^{5} 28^{21}, cf. Ps. 119^{109}) by continuing to defy God? This, however, is just what Job is doing, and continues to do; hence Ew. Di.[1] De. explain the phrase as meaning, Why should I make a desperate attempt to *save* my life by submitting to God, and allowing myself to be counted guilty by Him? But this sense of the idiom is against usage. RVm., with Schult., Rosenm., Renan, *at all adventures* (lit. *super quidquid fuerit = whatever happens*); but this is a highly questionable sense of על מה. It is far better, with Me. Di.[2] Bu. al., to omit על מה (which is not expressed by 𝔊) as dittographed from [13b] עלי מה. [If על־מה be omitted the v. is in the normal 3:3 rhythm.]

15. לא] so Kt.; לו, Qrê, 'A 𝔖𝔗𝔙, Saad. (𝔊 ἐάν με χειρώσηται ὁ δυνάστης ἐπεὶ καὶ ἤρκται [הֵחֵל]).

לא (לו) אֲיַחֵל] has been very differently understood: יִחֵל is to *wait* (as of rain, not waiting for man's command, Mic. 5^{6}), esp. to *wait expectantly*, c. 14^{14}, Is. 42^{4} 51^{5} al., usually sq. ל or אל; here, 6^{11} and Ps. 71^{14} abs., and so nearly = *hope*. Hence (1) *I do not wait* (pregn.; *sc.* for anything better), virtually = *I have no hope* (Me. Bu. RVm.[3] [Dr., *Book of Job in the Revised Version*, p. 37, n. *p*]); (2) *I do not wait = I need not wait* (Di.), *i.e.* I do not *wait* for my fate, I am sure of it (so virtually Da. RVm.[2], *I will not wait*, *i.e.* I will not wait for a more distant death, it is close at hand); but יִחֵל seems always to be used of waiting *hopefully* (for help, etc.); (3) Du., I cannot *hold out*, endure my present condition longer, "as in 6^{11}"; but this is not really the meaning of יחל in 6^{11}; (4) with לו, *For him* do I

wait (Del., cf. RVm.[1]), *i.e.* I am only waiting for Him to give me my death-stroke; but יחל never occurs in the sense of *waiting for* anything evil (contrast 30^{26}).

יקטלני] קטל is an *Aram.* word; elsewhere in Heb. only 24^{14}, Ps. 139^{19} †; with קֶטֶל, Ob.[9] †.

17. שמעו שָׁמוֹעַ] So 21^{2} (+ מלתי, as here), 37^{2}, Is. 6^{9} 55^{2} †; G–K. 113*n*.

אַחְוָתִי †] Both the √ and the form are Aramaic. חִוָּה (= חַוֵּי, ܚܰܘܺܝ, common in 𝕿 and Syr.; oft. = הגיד) in Heb. only 15^{17} 32^{6} $36^{2.\,10.\,17}$, Ps. 19^{3} † and prob. 52^{11}: אַחְוָה (properly אַחְוָיָה; hence Lag. Bu. here אַחְוָיָתִי) is an inf. Afel (cf. Dn. 2^{10} לְהַחֲוָיָה), used as a subst.; cf. Dn. 5^{12} אַחְוָיַת אֲחִידָן, the *declaring* of riddles: Ps. 49^{2} 𝕿 שמעו אחויתא דא, hear this *declaration* (teaching); for the form in Heb., see G–K. 85*b* (אַזְכָּרָה), 85*c* (הֲנָפָה, inf. from נוף, formed on the Aram. type, cf. הַוְדָּה, Dn. 5^{20}). 𝕲 ἀναγγελῶ = אֲחַוֶּה: so Di. Gr. Du. Be. But there are Aramaisms in Job; and the subst. is more forcible. [For the form of sentence (a subst. + באזני, but without a vb.) cf. 15^{21} and 2 S. 22^{7}; but in the latter case תבא has almost certainly dropped out (see Ps. 18^{7}, and cf. Gray, *Forms of Hebrew Poetry*, 182, n. 1), and the same may well have happened here.]

18. ערכתי] [ערך *to arrange, set in order* (*e.g.* pieces of wood, (the dishes on) a table, (the line of) battle) is used with מלין as the expressed object in 32^{14} (‖ השיב, *to answer*), and probably, with the same or a synonymous word understood but not expressed, in 33^{5} (‖ השיב) 37^{19} (‖ אמר ל) of careful, well-arranged speech. ערך משפט might, therefore, well mean *to set forth, or state a legal case*, supporting it with carefully arranged arguments; and such certainly seems, and is generally taken to be, the meaning in 23^{4}, where the parallel is particularly noticeable—אערכה לפניו משפט ופי אמלא תוכחות. For the use of משפט, not of legal *decisions*, but of *pleadings*, cf. 1 K. 3^{11}; and for a somewhat analogous use of ערך, cf. 2 S. 23^{5} ברית . . . ערוכה בכל, *a covenant* (*of which the terms are*) *fully and duly set forth* (Dr. *ad loc.*). The phrases in 23^{4} and here being the same, it would be most natural, if possible, to give it the same meaning in both passages (so RV.). But it is objected that Job has

not yet stated his case, and is still in v.^{22} only on the point of doing so. Hence Budde, *e.g.*, renders here by "ich habe die Verhandlung gerüstet," in 23^{4} by "darlegen wollt'ich vor ihm das Recht." This is not altogether satisfactory. Ehrlich would give the phrase here the meaning, *I foresee the result of the legal argument*,—an admirable parallel, it is true, to v.^{18b}, but a meaning that is very hazardously based on a doubtful interpretation of the difficult phrase ערכי הדיינים in *Pirke Abhoth*, $1^{8(9)}$. 𝔊 renders ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ἐγγύς εἰμι τοῦ κρίματός μου, reading קרבתי instead of ערכתי; reading with 𝔊 and pointing קֵרַבְתִּי we should obtain the phrase used in Is. 41^{21}; but this, too, might be open to the objection, for what it is worth, that v.^{18} would anticipate v.^{22}.]

משפט] rd. משפטי, with 𝔊𝔖, 1 MS^{K} Du. [Even if משפטי be read, the phrase remains virtually identical with that in 23^{4} (see last n.), and it is noticeable that Bu., who *translates* differently in 23^{4} and here, argues in favour of 𝔐 here and consequently of exact identity of phrase in the two passages.]

19. . . . מי הוא] as Is. 50^{9} מי הוא ירשיעני; see on 4^{7} (*Lex.* 216*b*).

21. הרחק] G-K. 29*q*.

תבעתני] as 7^{14}.

22. והשיבני] *and answer me*: lit. *turn me back* (*sc.* with a word; see Dr. on 2 S 3^{11}); with omission of דבר, as 20^{2} $33^{5.32}$, 2 Ch. 10^{16} (‖ 1 K. 12^{16} + דבר); cf. Dn. 3^{16} (Aram.).

23. 𝔊 πόσαι εἰσὶν αἱ ἁμαρτίαι μου καὶ αἱ ἀνομίαι μου; δίδαξόν με τίνες εἰσίν; surely reads [a] as 𝔐, and expresses פשעי וחטאתי by τίνες. [Attempts to emend (Be. Du.) 𝔐 on the basis of 𝔊 are therefore ill-advised. Still the recurrence of חטאות and חטאתי in the same v. are "not exactly an elegance" (Bu.), and some corruption earlier than 𝔊 is not improbable.]

25. ואת] את before an indeterm. noun is very anomalous (G-K. 117*c*; Ew. § 277*d* (2); Dav. § 72, R. 4): rd. prob. וְאִם (Be. Bu.); and cf. Kö. 288*g*. If correct, את will point to the *particular* piece of chaff symbolizing Job.

26. [כי] not *for* (RV.), but *that* after a question implying surprise or deprecation; as, *e.g.*, 6^{11} $7^{12.17}$, Gn. 20^{9}, Is. 22^{1}; *Lex.* 472*b*.]

27. ותשׂם] the jussive is out of place: rd. וְתָשִׂים (Dr. 171, 174; Bu.). G–K. 109*k* allows that the form here is not jussive in meaning; but whether it can be reasonably explained as due to rhythmical grounds is very doubtful. Cf. Da. 65, R. 6.

סד] 33[11] † (a quotation from here). Syr. ܣܐܕܐ, wooden *stocks*; in Acts 16[24] 𝔖 for τὸ ξύλον (as Jb. 33[11] 𝔊 for סד). Cf. מַהְפֶּכֶת and צִינֹק.

תִּתְחַקֶּה] חקה is to *cut in*, *grave*, *carve*: hence Pu. מְחֻקֶּה, *carved work*, 1 K. 6[35], Ezk. 8[10]; and התחקה (only here), to *cut in* or *grave for oneself* (cf. התפשט, to *strip off for oneself*, התפתח, *sibi solvere*; G–K. 54*f*); *i.e.* thou *incisest* or *makest thee a line against* (= *about*) the soles of my feet, fixest limits for them which they may not pass. Du. regards רגלי as repeated by error from [a], and pointing שָׁרְשִׁי, renders, "Thou makest thee a groove about my *root*," supposing the fig. to be that of a tree, and the allusion to be to some method of preventing the root of a tree from spreading unduly, or putting forth useless shoots. He further attaches to this line 14[5c], so as to form a couplet: Thou fixest its limit (חֻקּוֹ) that it cannot pass.

28. *And he*—a man thus miserably treated ([27])—*crumbles away like a rotten thing*—in particular (see on 5[3]) worm-eaten wood,—*and like a moth-eaten garment.* 𝔊 ἴσα ἀσκῷ, 𝔖 ܐܝܟ ܙܩܐ, *like a wine-skin*, *i.e.* כְּרֹקֶב, Aram. רוּקְבָּא, Gn. 21[14. 15. 19] 𝔗, 𝔖 ܙܩܐ, for חֵמֶת; for בלה of a water-skin, cf. Jos. 9[4] נאֹדוֹת בָּלִים. Be. adopts this reading; but 𝔐 yields a perfectly satisfactory sense. The 3rd person, following the 1st in v.[27], is, however, somewhat awkward; and hence v.[28] has been supposed to be either misplaced—Me. would place it after 14[2a], Sgf. after 14[2b], and Bi. after 14[3], though in neither place would it agree well with the context—or (Bu.) a gloss added by a later hand. With Du.'s explanation of 13[27c] 14[5c], הוא must be rendered *it*, and will refer to the "root" of [27c]. For כְּרקב (not כָּרקב, as is general when the subst. is not defined by an adj. or rel. cl. following), cf. 14[2. 6] 16[14] 31[18] 38[3] (Di.); and see G–K. 126*o*, *p*; *Lex.* 207*b*, f.

CHAPTER XIV.

2. [יָצָא] could also (cf. יעמד in *b*) be pointed as impf. יֵצֵא; in this case the construction is exactly as in v.[10], the first following impf. with *waw* consec. being in accordance with Dr. § 80, the second with Dr. § 76, *β*; in 𝔐 the vb. is pf. of experience (Dr. § 12) followed by the impf. with *waw* consecutive (Dr. § 80). It is not certain that 𝔊 (*ἄνθος ἀνθῆσαν*) read differently from 𝔐: in any case it is unnecessary to substitute יָצִץ (Wr.) or יצמח (Be.) for יצא; for יצא is used of plants (1 K. 5^{13}, Is. 11^{1}): like מלל (of plant life, *e.g.* Ps. 90^{6}) it is here used figuratively of men, as are מלל in 24^{24} and פרח and ציץ in Ps. 92^{8}.]

[וַיִּמָּל] We have parallel forms in 18^{16} יִמַּל, 24^{24} and Ps. 37^{2} יִמָּלוּ †; cf. לָעֶרֶב יְמוֹלֵל וְיָבֵשׁ, Ps. 90^{6}. It has been questioned whether the first four of these forms are Kal, from מָלַל*, to *droop*, *languish*, cogn. with אֻמְלַל, or Nif., from מָלַל, parallel to מול (cf. Ps. 58^{8} יִתְמוֹלָלוּ; Ps. $118^{10. 11. 12}$ בשם י׳ כי אֲמִילַם), to *cut off* (Ps. 90^{6}, with the implicit cogn. ptcp. as subject, הַמְּמוֹלֵל). The latter rendering seems the more probable. מלל is more naturally connected with מול than with אמל; and while in many of the passages either sense would suit, in Job 24^{24} be *cut off* is more suitable than *droop*; and to be *cut off* is such a common fate for grass that the objection that to *droop* or *languish* is what more normally happens to it, does not amount to much. 𝔊 *ἐξέπεσεν* = וַיִּבֹּל, *and fades away* (see Is. 28^{1} *τὸ ἄνθος τὸ ἐκπεσόν* = צִיץ נֹבֵל, ^{4} 40^{8}), which might well be the orig. reading; so Du.

3. [ואתי] 𝔊𝔖𝔙, Me. Di. Wr. Bi. Be. Bu. Du. וְאֹתוֹ, in better agreement with the context. For the emphatic position, cf. Gn. 12^{12}, 2 S. 12^{9}, 1 K. $1^{6. 35}$, Is. 57^{11} 58^{2}, Jer. 9^{2}, Ezk. 22^{12}, Hos. 2^{15b}: see further examples in Dr.'s n. on 1 S. 15^{1}.

4. [מי יתן] followed by an accus. of the thing longed for, as Dt. 28^{67}, Ex. 16^{3} al. לא אחד is the tersest possible statement that the thing desired is impossible. The context on both sides relates, however, to the shortness of man's life, not to the sinfulness: hence Bi.[1. 2] Be. Ch. Bu. regard the verse as a note written originally on the margin, and afterwards introduced by error into the text. Du. defends the v., regarding it as suggesting the ground why God should deal less stringently with man: sin is innate in him; ought not this to be a motive for His forbearance? Du. lengthens [b] by prefixing מֵחַטָּאוֹת, "not one is *without* sin"; but this strains unduly the מן.

5. [חֻקּוֹ (Kt.)] חק is originally something *cut in* (Is. 22^{16} חקקי בסלע משכן לו), and so something *incised*, or *engraved*, on stone or metal, *i.e.* a *statute*; then more generally something *prescribed*, in many different applications (*Lex.* 349) as a *prescribed allowance* of food (Gn. 47^{22}, Pr. 30^{8}), a *prescribed due* (Lv. 6^{11}), here and v.[13] a *prescribed limit* in time (on the question whether it also denotes a *prescribed limit* in space, see phil. n. on 26^{10} 38^{10}).

[עשית] 𝔊 ἔθου, Σ ἔταξας, 𝔙 constituisti, which point to שַׂמְתָּ; so Be. Bu. Du. There occurs indeed in 28^{26} בַּעֲשֹׂתוֹ למטר חק, but חק has not there the same meaning as here.

6. [מעליו] *from upon* him,—that thy unfriendly eye may rest *upon* him no more; cf. *e.g.* 9^{34}, Ex. 18^{22}, Am. 5^{23}, Jon. 1^{11} (*Lex.* 758*b*, b).

[ויחדל] חדל is to *cease* (v.[7 end]), *desist, forbear*; the meaning to *cease* (*sc.* from labour), *rest*, is very doubtful; the only parallel being 1 S. 2^{5}, where, however, חָדְלוּ עֲבֹד should almost certainly be read for חדלו עד. Read וַחֲדָל, *and desist, forbear* (Am. 7^{5} al.); so Bu. Be.[K] St.; Gr. וְנָח לוֹ, *that he may have rest* (impers., as 3^{13}); but it is not certain that ἵνα ἡσυχάσῃ represents this.

[ירצה . . . יומו] רצה, *to take pleasure in, enjoy*, with the acc., *e.g.* Ps. 102^{15}. יומו here virtually = *his* (finished) *day*— the hour toward sunset when he receives his wages (Dt. 24^{15}) and rests ($7^{1f.}$).]

7. ועד] Dr. 124, 136 and *Obs.*; cf. Pr. 19[19].

יחליף] in Kal (of a plant) to *come on*, *i.e.* to *sprout* (Ps. 90[5.6] בבקר כחציר יחלף: בבקר יציץ וחלף); in Hif. to *renew* (Is. 40[31]), or, as here, to *show newness* (G-K. 53*d*), *i.e.*, of a plant, to *put forth fresh shoots*, of a bow (29[20]), to *keep fresh* and pliable, opp. to old, dried up, and useless.

8. יזקין] G-K. 53*e*; Ew. § 122*c* (acc. to Ew. with an *inchoative* force = *senescere*; so המתיק, 20[12] *dulcescere*; האמיץ, Ps. 27[14] to *become courageous*; העשיר, Ps. 49[17] *ditescere*; הֵשַׁם, Jb. 21[5] *stupescere*; מרעיד, Dn. 10[11] *contemiscens*).

9. יפריח] *put forth buds* or *shoots* (G-K. 53*g*); Pr. 14[11] (fig.) ואהל רשעים יפריח, Ps. 92[14] בחצרות אלהינו יפריח.

עשה] = *produce*, as Gn. 1[11], Ezk. 17[6] al. (*Lex.* 794*b*, 2).

נטע] *something* (freshly) *planted*: 𝔊 νεόφυτον.

10. ויחלש] ו after ימות, Dr. 80; G-K. 111*t*. If חלש means to "waste away" (EVV.), any word may mean anything in Heb. The √ חלש means, as in Aram. (𝔗 and Syr.; *e.g.* ܚܠܫ = ἄνανδρος, ἀσθενής, PS. 1295), *weak*; it does not even, as is sometimes said, mean *prostrate* (except in a fig. sense), and it is opposed to גִּבּוֹר (Jl. 4[10] החלש יאמר גבור אני, Ex. 32[18] "the answering of חלושה," opp. to "the answering of גבורה"); in Ex. 17[13] read וַיְחַלֵּשׁ, *weakened*, *disabled*, as in Jb. 12[21], 𝔗 ותקוף מלכיא מְחַלֵּישׁ (Levy) for רִפָּה; in Is. 14[12] חלש על cannot possibly mean "lay low"; rd. either מֹשֵׁל כל־גוים or חולש על־גְּוִיּוֹת (lying) *powerless* on the corpses. 𝔊 ᾤχετο = וַיְהַלֵּךְ (see v.[20] 19[10], 𝔊 and 𝔐), and *is gone*, or even (Wr. Gr. Bu.) וַיַּחֲלֹף (9[26], Ps. 102[27]; cf. ἀπέρχομαι for חלף, 1 S. 10[3], Ct. 2[11], Bu.), forms a better sequel to ימות than ויחלש; and either of these, it must be admitted, may well be right.

ואיו] 𝔊 οὐκέτι ἐστίν, 𝔖 ܘܠܝܬܘܗܝ, which, unless paraphrases, will express וְאֵין or ואיננו; so Me. Sgf. Be. But this —quite apart from the fact that at least ואין (as distinct from ואיננו) is found only after verbs implying (1 S. 9[4]), or expressing (3[9], Ps. 69[21], Pr. 13[4] 14[6] 20[4], Is. 41[17] 59[11], Ezk. 7[25] †) a *search*— is, as Bu. Du. Peake all remark, much inferior to the question. Sgf. Be. are hypercritical. "The question," they declare, "is

out of place: for c. 3 leaves no doubt that the dead man was supposed to be in Sheol." But upon this argument ואין is equally out of place: for if the poet knew that the dead man was in Sheol, how could he say, "and he is not"? Obviously both *Where is he?* and *He is not* must be understood with the same tacit limitation, "Where *on earth?*" and "not *on earth.*" מי, איה, and other interrogatives are constantly used in Heb. with the force of a rhetorical negative (*no one*, *no where*, *not*, etc.); see, *e.g.*, 20⁷ אַיּוֹ.

11. Varied from Is. 19⁵ וְנִשְּׁתוּ מים מֵהַיָּם ונהר יחרב ויבש (of the *future* decay of Egypt, the ים and the נהר being the Nile): the poet applies the words more generally, ים having no doubt the sense of an inland sea or lake (as, *e.g.*, in ים כנרת). Di. Be. Du. strike out the v. as (Du.) a "thoughtless marginal citation on ^19a. b^, to which (after ^19c^) ^12a^ also belongs: both, forgotten by a scribe, in the end found their way here": Du. thus omits ^11^ altogether, makes ^10a. b. 12b. c^ the quatrain here, and ^19c. 12a. 20a. b^ the quatrain after ^18a. b. 19a. b^. But these transpositions are violent: ^12a^ is much more forcible where it is than after ^19c^; and the comparison in ^11^, so far from breaking the connexion between ^10^ and ^12^, forms an effective introduction to ^12^, and justifies the reinforcement, in different words, of the thought of ^10^. For the comparison expressed by the וְ *adaequationis* in ^12^, see ^19c^, Pr. 25²⁵ 26¹⁴ al.; *Lex.* 253*a*.

אזלו] The common Aram. word for *go*—in Heb. here, Dt. 32²⁶, 1 S. 9⁷, Jer. 2³⁶ (text doubtful, but not certainly wrong: see Dr., *Jer.*, p. 339 f.), Pr. 20¹⁴ †, usually with the force of "*go away.*"

12. עד בלתי שמים] בלתי occurs before a subst. in Is. 14⁶ †, מַכַּת בלתי סָרָה; and מבלתי, לבלתי often before an inf. (so, no doubt, עד בלתי, Dr. on Dt. 3⁸; *Lex.* 117*a*). Is. 14⁶, and the fact that the inf. is a subst., may defend עד בלתי here; but בלי is much more frequently used to negative a subst.; and we have twice עד בלי: Ps. 72⁷ עַד בְּלִי יָרֵחַ, Mal. 3¹⁰ עַד בְּלִי דָי. 𝔊 ἕως ἂν ὁ οὐρανὸς οὐ μὴ συνραφῇ (𝔍 donec non consuetur),—prob. a paraphrase: 'A ἕως ἂν κατατριβῇ (whence 𝔙 donec *atteratur*), ΣΘ 𝔊^A ἕως παλαιώθῃ, 𝔖^H ܥܕܡܐ ܕܠܐ ܡܫܬܡܫܐ, 𝔖—all = עַד בְּלוֹת שמים (for 'A see Gn. 18¹², Is. 51⁶, Field) till the heavens

wear away (so Geiger, *Urschrift*, p. 417; Bi. Be. Du.). It is true, בָּלָה is used of the heavens and earth, Ps. 102^{27} וְכֻלָּם כַּבֶּגֶד יִבְלוּ, Is. 51^{6} כי שמים כעשן נמלחו והארץ כבגד תבלה, to denote their gradual wearing away; but with עד the absolute negative בלתי (or בְּלִי) is more forcible.

ויקיצו וג׳] the change to singulars (𝔊^A 'A יקיץ, Θ (Field) ולא יָעִר מִשְּׁנָתוֹ: Be.^K Du.) is not necessary: when a *group* of persons is spoken of a change from sg. to plur., or *vice versa*, is frequent in Heb. poetry (cf. on 21^{30}). .Bu. would attach ^{12a} to ^{11} (cf. ^{19}), making $^{12b.c}$ an independent distich, and so leaving the two plurals by themselves.

14. היחיה] 𝔊 ζήσεται, probably a dogmatic rendering, intended to make Job affirm distinctly the thought of the resurrection. Cf. ἕως πάλιν γένωμαι, for ^{14c} עד בוא חליפתי. Du., however, supposes 𝔊 to imply, for הֲיִחְיֶה, וְיִחְיֶה, which he adopts, taking אם as expressing a wish (Ps. 81^{9} 95^{7} al.; G-K. 151*e*), "If only a man might die, and live again!" and regarding the line as the last of the quatrain, $13^{a.b.c}$ 14^{a}.

15. תכסף] Kal, Ps. 17^{12} †; Nif. Gn. 31^{30}, Ps. 84^{3} † (Zeph. 2^{1} לא נכסף = *unabashed*; see 𝔗 of Ps. 35^{4} 69^{7}). The Nif. being certain in Gn. 31, Ps. 84, Bu. would read it also here and Ps. 17^{12}.

16–17. Do these verses describe God's *present* attitude towards Job (so Ew. Di. De. Da. and most)? or do they carry on ^{15}, describing what God's *future* attitude would be, if he were to act as described in ^{15} (so Umbreit, Hi. Me. Studer, and esp. Bu.; also Ho.)? In the former case, they will be rendered: "For (giving the reason for the preceding wishes) now thou numberest my steps (watchest my movements jealously, as if I were a malefactor; cf. 13^{27}), Dost thou not keep watch upon my sin (שמר על, as שמר אל, 2 S. 11^{16} (על=אל, as often in some books; *Lex.* 41*a*), of Joab keeping watch upon Rabbath-Ammon; and, in a friendly sense, of keeping watch over so as to guard, שמר אל, 1 S. 26^{15}; שמר על, 1 S. 26^{16}, Pr. 2^{11} 6^{22}; the question indicated by the tone of the voice, G-K. 150*a*, *b*; or better, with 𝔊 Ew. Di. Du. לא תַעֲבֹר, Thou dost not *pass over* (Mic. 7^{18}, Pr. 19^{11}; cf. c. 7^{21}) my sin)?

My transgression is sealed up in a bag (Hos. 13^{12}); And thou plasterest over (13^{4}) my iniquity (keepest it securely fastened up till the day of reckoning)." In the latter case they will be rendered: "For then thou *wouldest* number my steps (and see that I made no slip"; cf. 31^{4} "Doth not *he* see my ways, and number all my steps?" also "I would declare unto him the number of my steps," in 31^{37}); "Thou *wouldest* not keep watch upon my sin; My transgression (*would be*) sealed up in a bag (to be brought out and remembered no more), And thou *wouldest* (וְתטפל) plaster over (whitewash, fig. for palliate) my iniquity." But [the first of these two interpretations was adopted in *The Book of Job* (1906)].

18. הַר נוֹפֵל יִבּוֹל] נבל, usu. of a flower or leaf, seems to combine the ideas of *fading* and *falling*; cf. Is. 1^{30} כי תהיו כְּאֵלָה נֹבֶלֶת עָלֶהָ, *fading and falling* in regard to its leaf, 28^{1} ציץ נובל, 34^{4} the heavens will rot and be rolled up like a scroll, וכל צבאם יִבּוֹל כִּנְבֹל עָלֶה מִגֶּפֶן וּכְנֹבֶלֶת מִתְּאֵנָה, Ps. 1^{3}; fig. of the earth, to *wither*, Is. 24^{4} אָבְלָה נָבְלָה הארץ; to *sink down exhausted*, Ps. 18^{46} בְּנֵי נֵכָר יִבֹּלוּ, Ex. 18^{18} (Jethro to Moses) נָבֹל תִּבֹּל גם אתה גם העם הזה אשר עמך; it is thus rather a strange word to apply to a mountain (RV. "cometh to nought" is too free a version). Still it might perhaps be used figuratively for *crumble away*. So Di. De.: "But a mountain falling *crumbleth away*"; Du. נָבֹל יִבּוֹל, "But even a mountain *crumbleth away*" ("the 'even' is implied by the emph. position of הר and צור"). 𝔊𝔖 both express יִפֹּל for יִבּוֹל; hence Lag. Sgf. Be. Bu. נָפֹל יִפֹּל, "But a mountain *surely falleth* (the allusion being to huge pieces of rock hurled down a mountain in a thunderstorm, or falling off through the slow action of the weather); Bu. (alt.) נוֹפֵל יִבְלֶה, a fallen mountain (נוֹפֵל, as Dt. 21^{1} al.) *weareth away* (cf. on v.^{12}). [There are indications in the MS that Dr. doubted whether 𝔐, which he followed in the translation, or any of the proposed emendations, ought to be accepted as satisfactory.]

יעתק] 𝔊 παλαιωθήσεται, from the Aram. sense of the √; see on 21^{7}.

19. שחקו] Ex. 30^{36} (ingredients of incense); Ps. 18^{43} =

2 S. 22^{43} (fig. of foes) †. Syr. ܦܣܣ, oft. for *συντρίβειν*. For the *order* (obj., vb., subj.), Dr. 208. 1; G–K. 142. *2a*.

תשטף] with ספיחיה, the plur. being construed as a collective (G–K. 145*k*); cf. 20^{11} 27^{20} 30^{15}, Is. 34^{13} 59^{12}, Ps. 18^{35} 37^{31}. Upon the same principle, the suff. in ספיחיה refers to מים (G–K. 135*p*, though all the instances cited are not certain); cf. c. 39^{15}. But ספיחיהם would be certainly better.

ספיחיה] *their overflowings*: Arab. *safaḥa*, to *pour out* (*e.g.* blood, Qor. 6^{146}); Is. 5^7 מִשְׂפָּח †, *shedding* (of blood); סָפִיחַ also, if rightly explained as meaning properly growth from *spilled* grain (Lv. 25^5 ספיח קצירך, ^{11}; 2 K. 19^{29} = Is. 37^{30} †), will be from the same √. Gr. Bu. Be.[K] סְחִיפָה, supposed to mean a *prostrating*, violent rain, a "cloud-burst," from סחף, a √ rare in Heb. (Jer. 46^{15} si vera l., Pr. 28^3 מָטָר סֹחֵף †), but common in Syr., in the meaning to *throw down* (*e.g.* a house, for *καθαιρεῖν*; = *ἐδαφίζω*, Lk. 19^{44}; PS. 2590 f.). As, however, there is no evidence that סחף was confined in Heb. to the prostrating effects of *rain*, the supposition that סחיפה meant specifically a "cloud-burst" is precarious.

20. תתקפהו] 15^{24}, Qoh. 4^{12} †; cf. תֹּקֶף, Est. 9^{29} 10^2, Dn. 11^{17} †. Aramaic תְּקֵף, *be strong* (Dn. $4^{8.\,17}$ al., Tgg. Syr.), and, except here and 15^{24}, only in late Hebrew. The sf., as in יְכָלְתִּיו, Ps. 13^5; G–K. 117*u*.

משוה] תְּשַׁוֶּה would be better.

21. יצערו] צָעַר, opp. to כָּבֵד, as Jer. 30^{19}, וְהִכְבַּדְתִּים וְלֹא יִצְעָרוּ; [so here in exact antithesis to יכבדו, *they come to honour* (RV.), יצערו means *they come to dishonour*; cf. ܨܥܝܪܐ = *ἄτιμος*, Mt. 13^{57}; ܡܙܕܪܥ ܒܨܥܪܐ, "sown in *dishonour*," 1 Cor. 15^{43}].

למו] the accus., as Ps. 73^{17}; cf. 9^{11}.

CHAPTER XV.

2. [החכם יענה דעת־רוח] usage would admit of דעת־רוח defining the answer given (cf. Gn. 41^{16}, Pr. 18^{23}, Neh. 8^{6}), in which case we should render, *should a wise man* (*i.e.* Job) *make reply with windy knowledge*: or of being that to which the reply is made (cf. 32^{12} 40^{2} and probably 33^{13}): then render, *should a wise man* (*i.e.* Eliphaz) *make reply to* (such) *windy knowledge* as Job has given utterance to. Parallelism favours the former rendering.]

3. הוֹכֵחַ] The inf. abs., defining *how* the actions mentioned in [2] take place, as often (G–K. 113*h*).

יסכן] in the sense of to *benefit, profit*, or (34^{9}) *gain profit*, only in Job (22^{2} 34^{9} 35^{3}).

[ומלים] 𝔊 ἐν λόγοις, reading, perhaps, במלים (without *waw*); but 𝔐 is perfectly possible, and an instance of the force of a prep. (here ב in בדבר) extending from one line of a distich to another; G–K. 119*hh*.]

6. יענו] "with the fem. dual, as Pr. 5^{2} 1^{16} 26^{28}, Ps 11^{4}" (Di.); G–K. 145*u*.

7. Wast thou the first (syntactically, "*as* a first one," accus. defining תִּוָּלֵד, G–K. 118*q*; cf. Is. 65^{20}) born to be a man? (אדם, accus. of product: 11^{12} 22^{16}, Mic. 3^{12}, Is. 24^{12}; G–K. 121*d*).

ראישון] "exhibits a double orthography, the phonetic with י, the etymological with א" (Du.); cf. ראישונה, Jos. 21^{10}, and G–K. 23*c*. The same orthography (ראישן) is found always in the Sam. Pentateuch, Gn. 8^{13} 13^{4} etc. (Kö. ii. 225*n*).

8. הַבְסוֹד] Cf. 22^{13}; and see G–K. 100*l*.

[הבסוד אלוה תשמע] סוד means (1) *familiar, confidential converse, secret*; cf. Am. 3^{7}, Pr. 11^{13} 25^{9}; (2) a company or circle who talk confidentially to and exchange secrets with one

another, and so sometimes *a council*; cf. Jer. 6^{11} 15^{17}; and in this latter sense and combined with יהוה or אלה (Jer. $23^{18.22}$, cf. Ps. 89^{8}), סוד means the circle of those who are admitted to intimacy with Yahweh and so obtain knowledge that is hid from other men. שמע ב is occasionally (37^{2}, and, perhaps, Gn. 27^{5}) an intensified mode of expressing what is commonly expressed by שמע with the acc. (cf. *Numbers*, p. 123); if so intended here, we may render, *Wast* (or *art*) *thou listening to the secret council of God?* otherwise render, (*Being*, or *standing*) *in the council of God, wast* (or *art*) *thou a listener?*]

[תשמע . . . ותגרע] the impf. either (1) vividly depicts the past (Dr. § 26 f.), alluding to the particular divine council (cf. the pl. in Gn. 1^{26}) in which the plan of creation was revealed; or (2) indicates recurrency (Dr. § 33)—*art thou wont to be a listener.* In either case ותגרע may have been intended to be not co-ordinate as in 𝔐, but consecutive וַתִּגְרַע—*didst* (or *dost*) *thou listen, and* (*so*) *draw to thyself.*]

10. שָׂב] The vb. שַׂבְתִּי in 1 S. 12^{2} †, and שֵׂיבָה often (Gn. 42^{38} etc.); but the ptcp. שָׂב only here, as in Bibl. Aram. (Ezr. $5^{5.9}$ $6^{7.8.14}$ †; = *elders*). 𝔗 סָב, Syr. ܣܳܒܳܐ (from ܣܳܒ), are both common.

ישׁישׁ] see on 12^{12}.

כביר] see on 8^{2}.

ימים] acc. of respect, *in regard to* (Anglicè "in"; Germ. "an"): Dr. 193, 194 (pp. 258 n., 259 n.); G–K. 131*q* (rather badly classed under "apposition," though qualified as apposition "in the *wider sense*"; notice, however, §§ 131*p* and 118*m*).

11. לָאַט] אַט, *gentleness*; as adv. acc., 1 K. 21^{27} וַיְהַלֵּךְ אַט †; with the ל of norm or state, as in לָבֶטַח (*Lex.* 516*b*); here לָ before the tone syll., elsewhere לְאַט, 2 S. 18^{5}, Is. 8^{6}; לְאִטִּי, Gn. 33^{14} †.

12. ירזמון] Either רזם † is a by-form of רמז, or ירמזון must be read with 5 MSS. רמז is common in Arab. Aram. and NH. in the sense of to *make a sign,* whether by the eyes, or in other ways, and likewise more generally to *hint at, signify* (*e.g.* in

interpretation, as "this *signifies* a great mystery"); thus Pr. 6[13] 𝔖 for מֹרֶה, *maketh signs* with the fingers, 10[10] 𝔖 for קֹרֵץ in קֹרֵץ עַיִן, often for (δια)νεύω, as Lk. 1[22. 62]; see also Is. 3[16] 𝔖 (ܪܡܙܐ for משקרות), and *Shabb.* 62*b ap.* Levy; Is. 58[9] 𝔗 מרמז באצבע, Gn. 44[19] 𝔗 [Ps.-J.] רְמַז יוסף למנשה, *made a sign* to Manasseh. To judge from usage elsewhere רזם (רמז) here will denote not directly the movement of the eyes in passion (e.g. *flash*, or *roll*), but, indirectly, the passion within as expressed by the eyes, and we must render, "And what do thy eyes *hint at*?" Bu. (after Rsk. Hfm.) suggests יְרוּמוּן (so 1 MS), which would suit the context well, and may be right; cf. Pr. 6[17] עינים רָמוֹת, 30[13] דור מה־רמו עיניו ועפעפיו יִנָּשֵׂאוּ.

13. והוֹצֵאת] after כי תשיב the *waw* consec. is required (Dr. 115, *s.v.* כי): either, therefore, the *milʿēl* tone is exceptional (Dr. 111. 4, *Obs.*; cf. G–K. 49*k*), or, as we always elsewhere have וְהוֹצֵאתִי, וְהוֹצֵאת, וְהוֹצֵאתָ should be read.

מלין] as this is a weak word, Du. would read מְרִי, comparing 23[2].

15. זַכּוּ] so 25[5], La. 4[7]; see G–K. 67*ee*.

16. נתעב] the Nif. ptcp., with gerundial force, = abominable; G–K. 116*e*.

נאלח] Ps. 14[3] = 53[4] נֶאֱלָחוּ †, as here, in a moral sense; in Arab. (conj. viii.) to *be confused*; of milk, to *turn sour*.

17. אחוך] חִוָּה is a purely Aram. root; elsewhere in Heb. only 32[6. 10. 17] 36[2], Ps. 19[3]; cf. אַחֲוָה 13[17] †.

וָאספרה] The so-called *waw apodosis*: Dr. 125; G–K. 143*d*. Nothing would be lost by its omission; but it is hazardous to infer that, because 𝔊𝔖𝔙 do not *express* ו, they therefore did not *read* it. EVV. do not express it; but the translators certainly read it.

18. ולא כחדו מאבותם] ולא כחדו must, if 𝔐 is right, be parenthetic: "which wise men declare, without hiding it, from their fathers," though מאבותם ולא כחדו would be a simpler construction; in fact EVV. translate as if the Heb. were this. Be. Du. ולא כִחֲדוּם אבותם, "and from whom their fathers did not hide (it),"—the sf. ם by G–K. 117*x*. On the other hand

ולא כחדו seems to go with, and to strengthen, ינידו; cf. Is. 3[9] וחטאתם כסדם הגידו לא כחדו.

20a. מתחולל] = *is tormented*; see on 26[5]. Σ ἀλαζονεύεται, 𝔙 superbit, 𝔖 ܡܫܬܒܗܪ, whence Be. מִתְהַלֵּל *boasteth* (*sc.* of his good fortune). But v.[21ff.] describe the wicked man as living in constant anxiety, and even in times of outward prosperity as filled with presentiments of evil. 𝔊 ἐν φροντίδι, 'A ἐνοδύνῃ, = 𝔐.

20b. As Bu. remarks, with the construction adopted above [b] drags after [a], and the effect is not elegant; but it appears to be right. The alternative and, it must be admitted, more obvious construction, "A (definite) number of years (= years which are numbered, Hi. De. RVm.) are (G–K. 146*a*) reserved for the terrible" (𝔊 ἔτη δὲ ἀριθμητὰ δεδομένα δυνάστῃ: De.), does not yield a satisfactory sense; "a few years" is alien to the context, and would, moreover, be expressed by שני מספר (16[22], Nu. 9[20]), not מספר שנים; and the explanation (De.), "a definitely fixed number of years, after which his fall comes," extracts more from the Heb. expression than it can be reasonably supposed to contain.

21. בשלום] 𝔊 ὅταν δοκῇ ἤδη εἰρηνεύειν,—a good paraphrase.

יבואנו] Cf. 20[22], Pr. 28[22] etc.; G–K. 118*f*.

22. שוב] inf. after האמין; cf. Jg. 11[20] (rather differently), and with ל, Ps. 27[13]; and see on 3[8]. לא האמין itself, as 9[16]. Du., violently, לא יסור for לא יאמין שוב, as v.[30]. 𝔊 μὴ πιστευέτω = אַל יַאֲמֵן (cf. [31]); so Me. Sgf.

צָפֻו] for צָפוּי ([or] G–K. 75*v* [for צפוי]), and, no doubt, in view of the extreme rarity of the form (unless צָפֻן be read) a mere error for it (Qrê and many MSS have צפוי). צפה is to *look out* as a watchman, צפה ל to watch *for*, in a bad sense Ps. 37[32], very rarely construed with an acc. (Pr. 31[27]); if correct, צפוי will mean here "*looked* (or *spied*) *out* (and brought) to the sword"; but the fig. and constr. are both strange; and prob. צָפֻן, "*reserved* (v.[20]) for" (Ew. Bi. Perles, Du., cf. Bu.) should be read.

אלי חרב] 𝔊 Me. Bi. Be.[Kit.] Bu. יְדֵי חרב (or אל) אלי. Idiomatic (5[20], Jer. 18[21], Ezk. 35[5], Ps. 63[11]), but not necessary.

23a. The man's helplessness is vividly indicated by the abrupt אַיֵּה (cf. 14[10]; and הנה, 9[10]; Bu.). 𝔊 has *κατατέτακται δὲ εἰς σῖτα γυψίν*: whence Me. נדד הוא לְלֶחֶם אַיָּה (to *become* the food of the vulture); Sgf. נִתַּן הוא לֶחֶם לְאַיָּה; Be. נִתַּן הוא לְלֶחֶם אַיָּה (Be.[Kit.] נוֹעָד for נִתַּן; but the Nif. of יעד is not a *passive*); Bu. נִתַּן (נוֹעָד or) הוא לְלֶחֶם אַיָּה.

23b. בידו] בְּיַד = *beside*, is very rare (Zec. 4[12], 1 S. 4[18] by emendation for בעד יד; Jer. 41[9] rd. as 𝔊; cf. בִּידֵי, Ps. 141[6]), the usual idioms being ליד, אל יד, or על יד. [The text here is uncertain; see below.] 𝔊 has: *οἶδεν δὲ ἐν ἑαυτῷ ὅτι μένει εἰς πτῶμα. Ἡμέρα δὲ αὐτὸν σκοτινὴ στροβήσει, Ἀνάγκη δὲ καὶ θλίψις αὐτὸν καθέξει*: whence Wr. Be. Du. would read יום (Be. כי נכון לְאֵיד; Du. (כי נֵכֶר בְּיָדוֹ) ידע כי נכון פִּידוֹ חשך יבעתֻהו צר ומצוקה תתקפהו; for איד, cf. 18[12] (𝔊 *πτῶμα*); for פיד, 31[29] (𝔊 *πτῶμα*); and for נֵכֶר, 31[3] (𝔊 *ἀπαλλοτρίωσις*). פִּידוֹ is better than לְאֵיד, and, though נֵכֶר is clever, has the advantage of 𝔊's support. It is true, נכון and בידו do not seem to be both wanted, and the two make the line [in 𝔐] unduly long. [Moreover, v.[24b] is in 𝔐 four-stressed, and therefore of a length unusual in Job (though see *e.g.* v.[20]). One effect of the emendations suggested on the basis of 𝔊 is to give vv.[23b. 24] the normal three-stress rhythm. But another effect, as Bu. has pointed out, is to place the subjects (יום חשך and צר ומצוקה) *first* in both parallel lines; this is a real difficulty, for there is no emphasis on the subjects such as accounts for the repetition of the order, subject, object, predicate, in 12[11], and the prefixing of the subj. in both clauses of 8[3] 5[7]; but the difficulty could be met by transposing יום חשך and יבעתהו; for that the subject should stand first in *one* of two parallels, more commonly in the second, as it would then do here, is a not uncommon result of the desire to give variety of cast to the parallel lines of a distich: see, *e.g.*, Is. 11[6], Ps. 2[2], Pr. 2[10] (subject first in the second line), and Jb. 3[17] (subject first in the first line); and cf. Gray, *Forms of Hebrew Poetry*, 66–68, 70 f.]

תתקפהו (𝔐)] the fem., agreeing with מצוקה, by G–K. 146*e*; Kö. 349*t*.

עתיד] see on 3[8].

כידור †] Arab. *kadara*, to *pour out* (*e.g.* water); in conj. vii. (*inkadara*) to *pour down* (of rain, etc.), *dart down* (of a bird of prey, or Qor. 81[2], of the stars falling from heaven at the last day), of foes *pouring* or *rushing* upon any one (Fleischer *ap.* Del. here—with, however, a doubtful attempt to fix the sense of כידור as battle-*throng*, by connecting these senses of *kadara* with *kadira*, to be *turbid*; Lane, 2596*b-c*).

25. אל (*bis*)] = על, as oft. (*Lex.* 41*a*). So v.[26a].

יתגבר] the Hithp., as 36[9], and (of Yahweh) Is. 42[13] †, *behaves himself mightily*.

26. [The v. is virtually under the government of the כי of v.[25], as is v.[28] of the כי of v.[27]. In 𝔊 the v. begins ἔδραμεν δέ, which might point to וירץ; cf. αὐλισθείη δέ = וישכן in v.[28].]

בצואר] with a (stiff) neck; cf. Ps. 75[6] תְּדַבְּרוּ בְצַוָּאר עָתָק. But כְּגִבּוֹר (Gr.), cf. 16[14b], is attractive: it would form a climax on יתגבר.

גבי] cf. 13[12]. Notice the dagesh, implying a preceding disj. accent, and consequently a pause of some kind, although עבי is in the *st. c.* Such cases are not unfrequent: even before a gen., the voice may take a rest, which will be marked by a disj. accent.

27. פימה †] Prob. for פְּאִימָה (G-K. 23*f*), from Arab. *fa'ama*, to *fill*, conjj. ii. iv. to *widen*, hence *taf'îm*, *bulkiness*, *corpulence*; *'uf'ima*, to *become full of fat*; *muf'am*, *mufa''am*, *fat*, *and wide within* (Lane, 2326). *'A Σ* πιμελή.

28. לא ישבו למו] Either (Di. Bu.) "(wherein) men (strictly היושבים: see on 4[19] 7[3]) should not (Gn. 20[9] 34[7]; Dr. 39*a*; G-K. 107*g*, end, *w*) dwell"; or (Hi. De. Du.), "(which) should not be inhabited,"—lit. *sit*, fig. for, to *flourish*, *be inhabited*, often of cities or countries, as Is. 13[20] (*Lex.* 443*a*, 4), Jer. 30[18] וְאַרְמוֹן על משפטו ישב, though not elsewhere of a house. In either case למו is dat. comm. *for themselves* (G-K. 119*s*, end; *Lex.* 516*a*); but its force can hardly be represented in English; cf. Gn. 21[16] וַתֵּשֶׁב־לָהּ, 22[5] שְׁבוּ לָכֶם פֹּה.

התעתדו] see on 3[8].

לגלים] 𝔊 ἄλλοι ἀπολοῦνται—a paraphrase, perhaps of 𝔐

incorrectly read לְגֹלִים (Köhler, *ZATW*, 1911, 155) rather than of לזרים (Be.), or than a literal translation of אחרים ישאו (Du.).]

29. יקום] as 8[15].

ולא יטה לארץ מנלם] מנלם has been rendered *possessions*, יטה לארץ being explained by the supposition that the "possessions" were pictured as heavily laden branches of fruit trees, or ears, *bending* to the earth; but in that case we must vocalize מִנְלָם (like מְקוֹמָם), as the Arab. √ is *nîl*, whence *nayl*, *possessions*, as Gn. 49[8] Saad. The √ does not, however, occur elsewhere in Heb.; nor can the expl. be said to be satisfactory. No doubt מנלם is corrupt. 𝔊 οὐ μὴ βάλῃ ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν σκίαν (צֵל, or possibly צִלָּם); 𝔗 ולא יתמתח לארעא מִנְהוֹן (מִן לָם=מנלם, "nought of what is theirs extends itself on the earth"); 𝔙 nec mittet in terra radicem suam (אֲצִלָּם); 𝔖 ܡܠܬܗܘܢ, *words*, for מנלם,—perh. (Me.) an error for ܡܠܘܬܗܘܢ, *abundance.* Di. שִׁבֳּלָם (Gn. 41[5]), with יִטֶּה; Hi. מְלִלָם, from מְלִילָה (Dt. 23[26]), "and their *ears* bend not to the earth" (*i.e.* their crops produce no ripe ears), quoting from Plut. *Moralia*, 81 B, τοὺς κεκλιμένους καὶ νεύοντας ἐπὶ γῆν, and Seetzen, *Reisen*, i. 152, of white Dhurra in Phœnicia, "when it approaches ripeness, it bends its top downwards." Either שִׁבֳּלָם or this is best; though, as the pronouns are here all sing., מְלִלוֹ, or מְלִלֹת, would be an improvement (יִטֶּה might stand with מְלִלֹת, see Gn, 1[14], G–K. 145*o*; or יִטּוּ could be read).

30. שלהבת] Ezk. 21[3], Ca. 8[6]†. Aram. שַׁלְהוֹבִיתָא, ܫܠܗܒܝܬܐ (*e.g.* Ex. 3[2] 𝔗𝔖); from שַׁלְהֵב, ܫܠܗܒ (PS. 1895), *shafel*, from לָהֵב* (G–K. 55*i*; Wright, *Comp. Gr.* 204 f.).

ויסור ברוח פיו] יסור is weak; and the pr. in פיו has no antecedent. 𝔊 for פיו has αὐτοῦ τὸ ἄνθος: ἄνθος often = צִיץ, צִיצָה, = פֶּרַח, Is. 5[24] 18[5]. Rd. with Be. Bu. Du. וְיִסָּעֵר (or פִּרְחוֹ) בְּרוּחַ פִּרְיוֹ (or וְיִסְעַר); cf. Hos. 13[3] (rd. כְּמוֹץ יְסֹעַר (יִסְעַר מִגֹּרֶן; Is. 40[24] וּסְעָרָה כַּקַּשׁ ישאם. Be.[Kit.], after 𝔊 ἐκπέσοι, "וְיִשּׁוֹר, a נָשַׁר*, *decidere*"; but no such verb exists (is נָשַׁל meant?).

31. שָׁו] for שָׁוְא (only here; but cf. צָו for שָׁוְא in Hos. 5[11])

is corrected in the Qrê. נחעה comes in strangely; and various emendations of it, or of בשו נחעה, have been proposed; but none carries conviction. Sgf. בַּבֹּשֶׁת נִתְעָבָה, "in abominable shame (idolatry)"; Be., with more probability, בְּעָשְׁרָתוֹ, "in his riches," but עָשְׁרָה, though quite a possible form, does not actually occur. And the repeated שָׁוְא is forcible.

32. בְּלֹא־יוֹמוֹ] In the poet. books the metheg, which marks the second syll. before the tone, if this syll. is the first in the word, and begins with *sh'wa*, provided the word has a disj. accent, and is preceded by no conj. accent, is attached to the *sh'wa*; cf. 19^6 22^{18} 28^{12} 30^8 32^{16}; and see Baer in Merx, *Archiv*, i. 201 f., more briefly G–K. 16*g*, end.

תמלא] without an antecedent is very awkward. 𝔊 *ἡ τομὴ αὐτοῦ πρὸ ὥρας φθαρήσεται*, whence Me. Bi. Du. נִזְעוֹ בְּלֹא יוֹמוֹ יִמַּל. נזע (see on 14^8) would hardly be suitable here; elsewhere, also, it is represented not by *τομή*, but by *στέλεχος* (14^8) and *ῥίζα* (Is. 11^1 40^{24}). *τομή* does, however, stand for זָמִיר, Ca. 2^{12} (cf. *τέμνειν* for זמר, to *prune*, Lv. $25^{3.4}$, Is. 5^6); so it *might* be a mistranslation of זְמוֹרָתוֹ (Nu. 13^{23} al.), his *vine-branch*, which, it has been supposed, has fallen out after [31b] תמורתו. Be. Bu. תְּמוֹרָתוֹ, *his palm-branch*, before בלא יומו, which would suit [31b] better than זמרתו; but the word is at least not known in this sense (תִּמֹרָה, 1 K. $6^{29ff.}$, Ezk. $40^{16ff.}$, means appar. a *palm-tree*). 𝔖 ܡܘܣܟܣܐ (= תמורה, [31b]; נצה, [33b]; נזע, 14^8; צמח, Ps. 65^{10}), unless a guess, *might*, however, as an inexact translation, presuppose this meaning of תְּמֹרָתוֹ in 31^b. Rd. then תְּמַּל (see on 14^2), the fem. referring to תְּמוֹרָתוֹ, if this be supplied before בלא יומו [or, perhaps better, to avoid the subj. standing first in both lines (see n. on v.[23b]), after תמל(א)], or, if not, to [30b] יונקתו. The latter is safer.

רַעֲנָנָה] 3 p. fem. in pause. The *verb* only here.

33. וַיַּשְׁלֵךְ] rd. וישלך; and cf. on 13^{27}.

34. גַּלְמוּד] see on 3^7. Is. 49^{21} has the *fem.* גלמודה.

35. The inf. abs. by G–K. 113*ff*; cf. Is. 21^5 59^4, Hos. 4^2.

תכין] 𝔊 *ὑποίσει* (cf. 1 K. 8^{64b} Be.), 𝔖 ܡܟܠܡ = תָּכִיל.

CHAPTER XVI.

3. [או מה] one MS [Ken.] ומה, but with ה ... או מה, cf. ה ... או מי, 38^{28}; and ה ... או, 38^{31} (Jg. 18^{19} is different); see *Lex.* 15*a*, 210*a*.]

ימריצך] Either (see on 6^{25}) "What *sickens* thee?," or "What *sours* thee?," the verb in the latter case being supposed to be derived by metathesis from מצר = Arab. مَضِرَ, *acer, acidus fuit*, and meaning in Hif. (Ges.) *irritare, exacerbare.* 𝔊 ἢ τί παρενοχλήσει σοι ὅτι ἀποκρίνῃ; 𝔙 aut aliquid tibi molestum est si loquaris.

4. [לו] Dr. in trans., *Tenses*, § 143, and BDB, takes [4b] as the protasis to [4c. d.]; parallelism rather favours giving to לו (with יש as in Nu. 22^{29}) the force *if only, O that!* (*Lex. s.v.* לו, 2): render then: "If only your soul were in my soul's stead!".]

אחבירה] Lag. Me. Bi. אַרְחִיבָה would suit well with פה (cf. [10]), but not with מלים (Bu.). [The vb. אחבירה is usually derived from חבר, *to join*, but by Barth (*Wurzeluntersuchungen*, 17; G–B.) from حبر (חבר, *to join*, being probably = خبر) *to be coloured, variegated, striped*: in ii. *to make coloured, beautiful, artistic*. The view is attractive, as suggesting an eminently suitable nuance; and, though the vb. does not occur again, the nouns חַבּוּרָה, חברברת, *stripes* (of the leopard), are naturally referred to the root. Yet the Arabic use of the vb. in reference to variegated language, beautiful, and then artificial, poems (Goldziher, *Abh.* 129–131), is presumably late, and due apparently to a development of literary taste and criticism peculiar to the Arabs.]

במלים] G–K. 119*q*. So בִמוֹ ראשׁי; cf. [9b. 10a], Jer. 18^{16} ויניד בראשו.

[4d. עליכם] a dittograph from [4c]: במו ראשי might be

single-stressed, but, as against במלים in [a], it is probably intended to be double-stressed; cf. במו פי with two stresses in 5^a.]

5. אאמצכם] G–K. 60*f*.

יחשך] Those who retain 𝔐 supply the obj. כְּאֵב from the *next* v. (cf. EVV.); but this [though a certain parallel to the construction may be found in Is. 58^1] is anything but natural. Rd. with 𝔊𝔖 Me. Bi. Sgf. Bu. לא אַחְשֹׂךְ. Wr. Bu. אַחְזֶק; but the pron. obj. is needed; Be. אֲחַזֶּקְכֶם, which in itself would suit [and give closer parallelism to [a]], but changes 𝔐 considerably.

6. אם אדברה] G–K. 108*e*; Dr. 143; cf. Ps. $139^{8b.9b}$.

מִנִּי] poet. for ממני: Is. 22^4 30^1 38^{12} †; in pause, מֶנִּי, 21^{16} 22^{18} 30^{10}, Ps. 18^{23} 65^4 139^{19} †.

7–8. [𝔊 om.[8] together with כל־עדתי in [7], perhaps on account of its unintelligibility (Be.). The verse and clause division of 𝔐, which is followed not only by RV. but also by Bu., is rhythmically most improbable. The rhythmical scheme being 2 : 2, 3, 2 : 2, or, if we give a double stress both to אך־עתה and כל־עדתי, 3 : 3, 3, 2 : 2; in either case the clause ותקמטני לעד היה, sufficiently suspicious on other grounds, is an isolated stichos between two distichs of apparently equal and parallel lines, though in the former of these probably, in the latter certainly, the lines are shorter than is usual in Job (on 2 : 2 see 19^{14} n.). Two distichs of the normal 3 : 3 rhythm (except that כל־עדתי is naturally one stress rather than two) are restored by transferring ותקמטני (omitting the ו) from [8] to [7], *i.e.* to the first distich, and dividing the distichs at השמות and בי respectively. The emendations (see following notes) which thus divide are, therefore, on the right lines, even though none of them is altogether satisfactory.]

7. הלאני] G–K. 75*ee*.—The change of person is awkward; hence Bu. אך אתה הֶלְאֵתָנִי (with [b] as 𝔐), Be.[T] אך עתה הלאני הֲשִׁמּוֹתִי כל־עדתי תקמטני; Du. (cf. Be.[K]), attractively, אך עתה הלאני הֱשִׁמֵּנִי כל־רעתי תקמטני (cf. 42^{11}).

8. Bu. keeps 𝔐 as it is, merely in [b] reading כעשׂי for כחשי. Be. (after ותקמטני) inverting, to gain a subj. for היה: כחשי בפני ענה לעד היה ויקם בי. Du. (after ותקמטני) retains 𝔐.

ותקמטני] 22[16]; on the ,ְנִ with Gaʿya, cf. Baer, p. 42; G–K. 16g. NH. and Aram. to *seize*, as Pr. 4^4 𝔗 (= חמך), 5^{22} (= לכד) (all in Levy); in Syr. *strinxit*, *colligavit*, *compressit*, hence *prehendit*, *e.g.* for πιέζειν, λαμβάνειν (PS. 3646). ܐܬܩܡܛ means, however, also to *be drawn together*, *i.e.* to *be wrinkled*, Dt. 34^7 𝔖; ܩܡܛܐ is a *wrinkle* (= ῥυτίς, Eph. 5^{27}; so in NH., *v.* Levy, iii. 325), ܩܡܛ is *to wrinkle* (Aq. in the Syr. Hex. here; *v.* Field); hence RVm. *hast shrivelled me up*.

כחשי] my leanness (prop. *failing* of flesh), as Ps. 109^{24}; cf. Gn. 41^{27} 𝔗 Ps.-J., פְּחִישָׁתָא, *lean* (of the kine); Qoh. 12^5 𝔗, פְּחִישׁוּתָא. Bu. כַּעְשִׂי, *my vexation* (5^2).

יענה ב׳] Ex. 20^{16}, Hos. 5^5 7^{10} al. [According to the accentuation of MT these words are a] circ. cl. (= *answering against me*); see Dr. 163 n. (1 S. 18^5, Jer. 15^6, Ps. 50^{20}, Is. 3^{20}) [cf. 30^{28} n.].

9. וישטמני] שׂטם combines the ideas of *hatred* and *persecution*, to *hate actively*: 30^{21}, Ps. 55^4 באף ישׂטמוני; Gn. 27^{41} 49^{23} 50^{15} †; מַשְׂטֵמָה, Hos. $9^{7.8}$. 𝔊 κατέβαλεν, 𝔖 ܣܚܦܢܝ; perh. = וַיִּשְׁסְעֵנִי (ܣܚܦ, *discerpsit*, Pa. *diffregit*, often for διασπάω, but in 2 K. 9^{23} for שׂטם) or (Du.) וַיִּרְטְשֵׁנִי. [Bu. retains וישטמני, but suggests חרה for טרף: in this case the figure of the wild beast disappears.]

חרק . . . בשניו] see on v.[4].

צרי וג׳] 𝔖 צָרַי ילטשו עיניהם לי. Before [90] 𝔊 has βέλη πειρατῶν αὐτοῦ ἐπ' ἐμοὶ ἔπεσεν = חִצֵּי גדודיו עלי (בִּי or) נָפְלוּ.

10. בפיהם] 9 MSS פיהם (the renderings of 𝔖𝔗𝔙 are not evidence that they did not read בפיהם); but see on v.[4].

יתמלאון †] lit. either *form themselves into a* מלא (Is. 31^4; Ew. Hi.), or *fill themselves up*; in either case = *mass themselves together*. Schult. compares the Arab. *tamālaʾa* (conj. vi.), to *agree* or *assist one another* to do a thing (Lane, 2729); Hi. cites Arnold's Amrulk. carm. iv. p. 2, فتمالؤوا على قتله.

11. עֲוִיל] עֲוִיל means *children*; see 19^{18} [n.] 21^{11} †. Read עַוָּל [or עולים; so some MSS of 𝔊, 𝔗: cf. רשעים in [b]], *unrighteous*, with 𝔊𝔖𝔗𝔙, as 18^{21} 27^7 29^{17} 31^3. [This is preferable to treating עויל here as a ἁπ. λεγ. = עַוָּל (Ges. Ew.); or to explaining עויל in

all those passages as a diminutive (used here contemptuously) of עֲוִל (Ehrlich); a diminutive of עַוָּל, *wicked*, is distinctly out of place in 21[11] (cf. the ילדיהם), and is at best not more suitable than עֲוִל here, עויל = *child*, in 19[18]. On the at most very rare and somewhat doubtful examples in Hebr. of the diminutive *kutail*, which would strictly require עֻוַיל here, see G–K. (Eng. tr.) 86*g*, note; Brockelmann, § 137.]

על ידי] [Cf. מביא על ידי, 2 K. 10[24]; הגיר על ידי חרב, Jer. 18[21], Ezk. 35[5], Ps. 63[11]. 𝕲 seems to have read ידי in [a] and על without ידי in [b]—erroneously.]

יִרְטֵנִי] At least יְרֻטֵנִי must be read: the √ is יָרַט (Nu. 22[32] †), not רָטָה; cf. יְרָאוּ from יָרֵא, but יִרְאוּ from רָאָה. Perhaps, indeed, as the √ is intrans., and in Ar. *warrata* (conj. ii.) is *conjecit*, *præcipitem dedit*, the Pi. pf. יִרְטֵנִי would be the correct reading.

12. Notice the word-painting in the two Pilpels.

פרפר] Ar. *farfara* is to *shake violently*, also to *break*, *cut*, *tear* [cf. الذيب يفرفر الشاة, the wolf mangles the sheep—Lane, 235*h*]: [Assyr. *to break in pieces*: cf. (if the falcon) *bu'uršu ina pišu ip-ru-ur*, break its prey with its bill, Del. p. 545]; Syr. ܦܪܦܪ is to *flap* (wings), Eth. to *be convulsed*; in Heb. פורר is to *split* or *cleave*, Ps. 74[13] אתה פוררת בעזך ים, Hithp. Is. 24[19] פור התפוררה ארץ.

פצפץ] cf. Jer. 23[29] הלא דברי כפטיש יְפֹצֵץ סלע.

[ויקימני] possibly from יקימני (cf. the simple impf. in the ‖ [13]), through a repetition of the preceding י as ו: the omission of *καί* in 𝕲 is, however, scarcely proof of the reading.]

13. רביו] *archers*; so Jer. 50[29] †; cf. רֹבּוּ, Gn. 49[23] †, and רֹבֶה קַשָּׁת (? rd. רֹמֵה קֶשֶׁת), Gn. 21[20] †. [𝕲𝕾𝕿𝖁 Ew. Bu. Du. al. render by *arrows*, which, if legitimate, would be preferable; with יסבו על cf. Jos. 7[9], 2 Ch. 18[31], where the subjects are *personal*.]

יפלח כליותי ולא יחמל] cf. La. 3[13] הביא בכליותי בני אשפתו; Pr. 7[23] עד יְפַלַּח חץ כְּבֵדוֹ.

מְרֵרָתִי †] cf. מְרֹרָה, 20[25].

[**14.** פרץ על פני פרץ] *with breach upon breach; with one breach after another*. The פני (om. by one MS [Ken.]) is strange,

and was perhaps not read by 𝔊 (ἐπί). For עַל, *in addition to*, see 13^{18} n.; *Lex. s.v.* עַל, 4*b*, p. 755*b*; and with the idiom cf. Qor. 31^{13} حَمَلَتْهُ أُمُّهُ وَهْنًا عَلَى وَهْنٍ.]

15. גלדי†] In Syr. and Arab. the *skin* or *hide* of an animal; in the Mishna (*Mikw.* 9^{2}) of a *crust* forming over a wound (cf. Rashi סַכָּה יְבֵשָׁה; Ki. עור בערבי נקרא אלגלד ויש מפרשים קרום שעלה על המכה ובדברי רז״ל הוּגְלְדָה הַמַּכָּה (*a crust*)); in Talm. of *leather*; in 𝔗 of a *plate* of *metal*, Nu. $7^{13.\ 19}$, 𝔗 Ps.-J., Ezk. 27^{24}; the √ in Aram. means to *be hard*. Here, no doubt, chosen to denote the *hard*, *lifeless* skin of a leper.

עללתי] from עלל = Ar. غَلَّ, Aram. עַל (both common), to *go in* (hence עֹל, غُلّ, *yoke*, as something *entered into* by the animal's neck); hence in Poʿel, to *make to enter*. AV. *defiled* (so RVm.), follows Rashi (לִכְלַכְתִּי; *v.* Levy, *NHWB*) and Ralbag (לִכְלוּךְ ענין).

קרני] [Che. (*EBi.* 2111), objecting that "horn" is unsuitable here, proposes יקרי (with חללתי for עללתי).] Arnold, in *AJSL* xxi. 170, proposes *forelock* as a meaning of קרן here [and in several other passages, *e.g.* Dt. 33^{17}, 1 S. $2^{1.\ 10}$, Ps. $75^{5.\ 6.\ 11}$ 89^{18}. For this sense Arnold appeals (1) to what is said of قَرْن in the *Lisânu 'l-ʿArab*, xvii. 209 ff.: "القرن is the forelock (الذؤابة), and some limit its application to the forelock of the woman and to her braid (ضفيرة). . . . And the قرن of the man is the crown of the head. . . . A certain one was called ذو القرنين because he had two locks that he braided on the two horns of his head and let them hang down"; and (2) to modern Bedawy usage: "side-locks are worn by men at their natural length; so it is said in praise of a young man's fortunate beauty, 'he has great and long horns'" (Doughty, *Arabia Deserta*, i. 469; cf. p. 382, ii. 220)].

16. חמרמרה (Kt.)] G–K. 145*k*. The Qrê (־רוּ) corrects the less usual construction; but cf. Dt. 21^{7} ידינו לא שָׁפְכָה (Qrê שפכו); 1 S. 4^{15} ועיניו קָמָה (not corrected; in 1 K. 14^{4} קמו עיניו); 2 S. 10^{9} כי היתה אליו פני המלחמה; Ps. 73^{2} כאין שֻׁפְּכָה אֲשֻׁרָי (Qrê שפכו); and c. 14^{19} [n.] and the many other cases given in G–K. *l.c.* (against the view that the ־ָה may be a 3rd *fem.* plur., as in

Aram., see G–K. 44*m*, and esp. Nöld., as there cited). חֳמַרְמְרוּ (G–K. 55*e* on the reduplicated form) recurs, La. 1^{20} מֵעַי חמרמרו, 2^{11} חמרמרו מעי †: in La. 1^{20} 2^{11} the √ is plainly, I. חמר = Arab. خمر, to *ferment* (whence חֶמֶר = خمر, *wine*), fig. *be in a ferment*, *be agitated*, *disturbed* (cf. in Qal, Ps. 46^{4} יהמו יֶחְמְרוּ מימיו); but here the √ seems to be II. חמר = Arab. حمر, to *be red* (whence חֲמוֹר = حمار, *ass*, from its *reddish* colour), my face *is inflamed* from weeping (חמרמר = to *be reddish*; cf. the adjj. אֲדַמְדָּם, יְרַקְרַק, etc., G–K. 84^{b}, *n.*): so Hi. De. Di. Bu. Du. RVm. Cf. Ibn Ezra, או הוא מן (the suffering) בלשון קֶדֶר התאדמו ברוב הַחוֹשׁ יהמו יחמרו מימיו. RV. *is foul*, prob. from Ḳi. נֶעְכָּרוּ. It is strange, however, that the same unusual form should have two senses; and Ges. *Thes.* explained all the occurrences from *æstuare*, here *de facie lacrimarum æstu inflammata*; cf. 𝔖 ܐܬܟܡܪ, 𝔙 intumuit, 𝔗 מִיפַשְׁפְּשָׁן, *are turbid* (so for יחמרו, Ps. 46^{4}).

17. על] for על אשר = *though*. So Is. 53^{9} על לא חמס עשה (*Lex.* 758*a*).

19. שהדי †] Aram. = Heb. עד; cf. יגר שָׂהֲדוּתָא = Heb. גַּל עֵד, Gn. 31^{47}. For other cases of a Heb. and Aram. synonym in parallelism, cf. 15^{3} (מלין and דבר) 37^{23} (שגיא and רב) 39^{5} (פרא and ערוד).

20. 𝔊 ἀφίκοιτό μου ἡ δέησις πρὸς Κύριον, Ἔναντι δὲ αὐτοῦ στάζοι μου ὁ ὀφθαλμός, whence Sgf. תְּחִנָּתִי תָּבֹא אֶל־אֱלוֹהַּ ולפניו דלפה עיני; Be^{T}. better, תְּפִלָּתִי תִּגַּע אֶל־אֱלוֹהַּ ולפניו דלפת עיני; Du. יִמָּצֵא לִי רֵעִי (ᵇ as 𝔐), May my friend (God) let himself be found (Is. 55^{6}) by me! It is objected to 𝔐 that מליץ elsewhere means *interpreter* (33^{23}, Gn. 42^{23}, Is. 43^{27}; cf. 2 Ch. 32^{31} †), and that *mockers* are elsewhere לֵצִים (Ps. 1^{1} al.); still, as הליץ means to *mock* (Ps. 119^{51} †), there is no reason why the ptcp. should not have meant *mocker*. The clause is, however, very short; hence Bu. מליצי רֵעִם רֵעָי or מליצי צדיק רֵעָי; [but this leaves the parallelism as imperfect as in 𝔐; the parallelism of 𝔊 is some indication that it stands nearer the original than 𝔐].

פ' דלפה] Qoh. 10^{18}, Ps. 119^{28} דָּלְפָה נַפְשִׁי מִתּוּגָה †; דֶּלֶף, Pr. 19^{13} 27^{15} †. Aram., both Syr. and 𝔗, but apparently rare. Is. 38^{14} דַּלּוּ עֵינַי לַמָּרוֹם.

21. ובן] rd. with 5 MSS, Ew. Di. De. etc., וּבֵין; בין . . . ל, as Gn. 1[6] al. [אדם is then parallel to גבר as in 14[10]; בן־אדם occurs in Job only in 25[6].]

22. שנות מספר יאתיו] 𝔊 ἥκασι is due rather to placing (like some moderns—Hoffm. Be.[T]) illegimately on the impf. the force of the pf. than to reading אתיו. Honth. שנות מִסְפָּרִי אתיו (but חמו rather than אתיו would express the sense required: cf. Ps. 102[28]); Hitz. שעות (late Hebrew for *hours*) instead of שנות; Lag. מִסְפֵּר for מספר; Bi. שֹׁנוֹת מספר, *repeaters of wailing*, which he supposes to be a term for mourning women.]

יאתיו] after the fem. שנות; cf. Hos. 14[1], Ca. 6[9], 1 K. 11[3] (G–K. 145*u*) and 15[6] (after a *dual* fem. noun).

CHAPTER XVII.

1. [The rhythm is 2 : 2 : 2—a variant of 3 : 3 in some poems (*Forms of Hebrew Poetry*, 182), but in Job it is, at most, very rare. Other doubtful examples are v.^{11} 21^{29}.] Du., to gain two lines of three beats each: רוחו חִבְּלָה ימי נֶעֶזְבוּ קברים לי, His spirit (anger, as Jg. 8^{3}) has destroyed my days, The graves are left (Is. 18^{6}) to me; but עזב ל is to abandon or leave to the power or possession or custody of any one (39^{14}, Ex. 23^{5}, Is. 18^{6} יֵעָזְבוּ יחדו לעיט הרים ולבהמת הארץ), and the idea which is wanted here is not to *be abandoned* or *left to*, but to be *reserved for*. [Yet though Du.'s emendation is not acceptable, 𝔐, which is rhythmically unusual (see above), is far from certain. נזעכו is supposed to be an alternative form for נדעכו (6^{17}), which is, indeed, read by 10 MSS here; זעך for דעך is otherwise quite unknown. Whatever its Hebrew original, 𝔊 is obviously paraphrastic—*ὀλέκομαι πνεύματι φερόμενος, δέομαι δὲ ταφῆς καὶ οὐ τυγχάνω* (cf. 3^{21} 𝔊); and all that is certainly common to 𝔐 and 𝔊 is רוח and קבר(ים); and it is quite unsafe to claim (Bi.) that 𝔊 om. ימי נזעכו—exactly that and nothing more. Again, that *φερόμενος δέομαι* presupposes נזע בי (Du. apparently, Be.^{K}) is, to say the least, altogether uncertain; nowhere else does *φέρειν* = נזע, and the fact that in the Pent. בי אדני is rendered *δέομαι κύριε* is far from proving that בי קברים would have been rendered *δέομαι δὲ ταφῆς*.]

[קברים] not an intensive pl. (*Lex.*), but rather, if the text is correct, a pl. of extension, virtually equal to *grave-yard, cemetery* (G–K. 124*c*; Kön. iii. 264*e*). An intensive pl.—a (stately) tomb—would be suitable in 21^{32}, 2 K. 22^{20} (= 2 Ch. 34^{28}), 2 Ch. 16^{14}; but in all these cases the pl. used is קברות. In Neh. 3^{16} קברי דויד is an abbreviation of, or synonymous with, קברי בני דויד, 2 Ch. 32^{33}.]

2. [𝔊 *λίσσομαι κάμνων, καὶ τί ποιήσας*, is brief and probably

paraphrastic. For guesses as to the Hebrew lying behind it see Be. and Du. But here, too, it is impossible to assert positively that any particular words of 𝔐 were or were not read by 𝔊.]

הֲתֻלִים] an abstract n., like זְקֻנִים, etc. (G–K. 124*d*), formed from the secondary √ הָתַל (13^9 n.). A ptcp. הֹתְלִים (Bu.), like דֹּבֵר from דִּבֶּר, is precarious.

בהמרותם] inf. c. Hif. from מרה, with d. f. dirimens (9^{18}, Ex. 2^3 הַצְּפִינוֹ; G–K. 20*h*), *on their defiance*. Du. בְּתַמְרוּרִים (Jer. 6^{26} 31^{15}, Hos. 12^{15} †), *in bitternesses* (cf. 𝔖 ܒܡܪܝܪܘܬܐ, 𝔙 et in amaritudinibus,—though not necessarily pointing to this *reading*); cf. 13^{26a}. Bu. מְרִמָתָם or חֶרְפָּתָם.

תָּלַן] the juss. is out of place: read תָּלִין. Bu., thinking 𝔐 weak, עֵינַי (= תִּכְלֶינָה) תִּכְלַךְ (11^{20}).

3. שימה] 𝔐 implies that שׂים was used absolutely in the sense of *give* (a pledge); but it is better to get the obj. by pointing עֶרְבֹנִי; so 𝔖 Saad. Ol. Hfm. Be. Bu. Du.; for שׂים, cf. נתן, Gn. 38^{18}.

מי הוא לידי יתקע] מי הוא as 4^7 13^{19}; *Tenses*, § 201 (2). לידי יתקע, the Nif. reflex., *strike himself into my hand* = agree to become surety for me (cf. Pr. 6^1 בני אם עָרַבְתָּ לְרֵעֶךָ תָּקַעְתָּ לַזָּר כַּפֶּיךָ; 11^{15} 17^{18} אדם חסר לב תקע כָּף עֹרֵב עֲרֻבָּה לפני רעהו; 22^{26} אל־תהי בתקעי־כָף בַּעֹרְבִים מַשָּׁאוֹת). Be. מי הוא לִי יָד יִתָּקַע.

4. תְּרֹמֵם] an obj. is desiderated: read with Me. Di. etc. תְּרֹמְמֵם.

5. לחלק] pointed by 𝔐 as a noun, and as such variously interpreted—*share* (of a feast), or *prey* (RV.); see exegetical n. Bu. points לְחַלֵּק (Piel infin.), and renders לחלק יגיד, *invites to share* (his table); but this gives to הגיד a meaning that is not found elsewhere. For הגיד, *to denounce*, *inform against*, see Jer. 20^{10} where, according to the usual interpretation, the person denounced is as here in the acc.; in Jos. $2^{14.20}$, Lev. 5^1, Pr. 29^{24} the explicit or implicit acc. is the thing denounced.

6. והציגני] Rd. either הציגני (𝔙), or (𝔊 ἔθου δέ με) וַתַּצִּיגֵנִי (so Me. Sgf. Be. Du.): Bu. הִצִּיגַנִי; but it will hardly have been the work of his friends.

למשל] rd. לְמָשָׁל.

ותפת לפנים] a(n object of) spitting to (the) faces (of other people), *i.e.* one before whom people spit (as a mark of aversion); so Hi. Cf. Is. 53[3] כְּמַסְתֵּר פנים ממנו, *as* (one, as to whom) there is a hiding of faces from him = one from whom men hide their faces. Or (𝔊𝔖𝔙 לִפְנֵיהֶם), a(n object of) spitting *before them* (the peoples of v.[a]). Not (De. Di. Du.), one in whose face there is a spitting (= in whose face men spit); for to spit *in* the face is idiomatically בִּפני פ' (Nu. 12[14], Dt. 25[9]), and the pronoun would have been expected (תֹּפֶת בפניו). תֹּפֶת only here; the √ would be תוף (like בשת, נפת from בוש, נוף); Aram. תּוּפ', Levy, iv. 658[a] (two instances in Talm.); Eth. תפא, Nu. 12[14] al. (Di. *Lex.* 573). Perhaps, however, we should read ומופת לִפְנֵיהֶם (𝔊 αὐτοῖς; so 𝔖𝔙) and a *portent* (𝔙 exemplum) *before them* must I be (Perles, Be. Bu.); cf. Dt. 28[46] לאות ולמופת; Ps. 71[7] כְּמוֹפֵת הייתי לרבים.

אהיה] *I am to be* (see on 9[29]).

7. יְצֻרַי †] my *framed things* = parts of the body, members: יָצַר often of God's *forming* man, as Gn. 2[7-8], Jer. 1[5], Ps. 94[9]. Hfm. Bu. יִצְרַי, *my imaginations* (from יֵצֶר, Gn. 6[5] 8[21], Dt. 31[21]); cf. 𝔖 ܬܪܥܝܬܝ, *my thoughts*.

כֻּלָּם] Be. כָּלִּם or כָּלוּ, *come to an end* (with יְצֻרַי).

9. וּטְהָר] *ṭᵉhor-*, cf. 38[7] בְּרָן־יַחַד, Nah. 1[3] Qrê וּגְדָל־כֹּחַ; G-K. 9*u*, 1*c*; Gi. Baer, and other edd. (with Ḳi.), וַטֲהָר, G-K. 10*h* (cf. Baer, p. 43).

10. וְאֻלָּם] so, for אוּלָם, only here, doubtless to produce an assonance with כֻּלָּם.

כֻּלָּם] [om. with one MS, the distich being at present 4 : 3, or] with 5 MSS read כֻּלְּכֶם: the case is not parallel to those in which a 3rd pers. *follows* a 2nd pers. idiomatically, as שִׁמְעוּ עַמִּים כֻּלָּם, Mic. 1[2] = 1 K. 22[28], Mal. 3[9] וְאֹתִי אתם קבעים הַגּוֹי כֻּלּוֹ, and in such cases as Is. 22[16] 54[1.11] etc. (G-K. 144*p*); [cf. 12[4] n. end].

11. Except here, זִמָּה is always used in a bad sense, as Is. 32[7] (of a scheme for ruining the poor in a court of law), Hos. 6[9], Ps. 26[10], and especially of unchastity, Jb. 31[11], Lv.

18[17] etc.; hence on this ground the correctness of 𝔐 has been questioned. מוֹרָשׁ is a *possession* (Is. 14[23] מוֹרַשׁ קִפֹּד); and מורשי לבבי are supposed to be a fig. for thoughts and hopes, the cherished belongings of the heart. But the fig. is far-fetched. Di. Du. מֹאָרְשֵׁי = מוֹרָשֵׁי, *desires* (cf. Ps. 21[3] † אֲרֶשֶׁת שפתיו ‖ תַּאֲוַת לבו), from the √ preserved in Ass. *erêshu*, to *desire*, *ask for; erishtu*, desire (F. Del. *HWB* 139[a]). [Wr. suggested מיתרי for מורשי (cf. 𝔊 ἄρθρα), and] Bu. יָמַי עָבְרוּ לְמוֹתִי (or better לָמוּת) נִתְּקוּ מֵיתְרֵי לבבי ("broken are the cords (Jer. 10[20] al.) of my understanding"—my mental faculties are giving way), Du. ימי עברו מִתִּקְוָה צִמְּתוּ מֹאָרְשֵׁי לבבי, My days pass away without hope; They (indef., as 7[3]) have annihilated the desires of my heart. [𝔐 gives the suspicious rhythm 2 : 2 : 2 (see on v.[1]; 𝔊 suggests, and the emendations cited present, the normal rhythm 3 : 3.]

12. [The entire v. seems to have been absent from the original text of 𝔊.]

קרוב מפני] [there is no justification in Hebrew usage for rendering this *near to*; but Arabic uses من regularly after the vb. قرب and the adj. قريب, as also after the synonymous vb. دنا, *e.g.* Qor. 18[23] لأقرب من هذا, that I may come near to this; 7[54] ان رحمة الله قريب من المحسنين, the mercy of God is near to the righteous. The use of מפני in 𝔐 is, therefore, scarcely more questionable than the use of מִן, if we read with] Bu., redividing the consonants in [b], לילה ליום ישימו אור קְרוֹבָם פֶּן־יֶחְשָׁךְ׃, "the light of their friend, they say, shall not become dark." Du. conjectures לילה ליום אָשִׂים ואור מִפְּנֵי חֹשֶׁךְ, *i.e.* "Job lives now only in the 'night,' in thoughts of death." Be.[K] לילה ליום אשים (or יוּשַׂם) אור בֹּקֶר (so Gr.) מִפְּנֵי חשך. But "before" in Heb., except an idea such as that of motion (נָס מפני) or *origin* (ירא מפני) is implied, is לִפְנֵי, not מִפְּנֵי; hence in both Du. and Be. לִפְנֵי, not מִפְּנֵי, must be read.

13. רפדתי] See on 41[22 (30)], where it is shown that רפד here and 41[22] must be from a distinct √ from that of רַפְּדוּנִי, Ca. 2[5], and רְפִידָה, Ca. 3[10], viz. Ass. *rapâdu*, to *stretch oneself*, unless רבדתי and ירבד (cf. רבד, Pr. 7[16] and 1 S. 9[25] 𝔊) should be read for רפדתי (here) and ירבד (41[22]).

14. It is argued (Bu.) (1) that לשחת קראתי אבי is more forcible than לשחת קראתי אבי אתה; (2) that שחת is fem., and so cannot be addressed אבי; and (3) that sister is suitable for רמה, but hardly mother: hence Bi., he concludes, "may be right" in omitting אבי as added by some one who thought that אמי should not stand alone,—though it is already in 𝔊,—and in reading לשחת קראתי אמי ואחותי לרמה. So Du. Be. [𝔐 gives the infrequent rhythm 4 : 3; for examples of which, not all certain, see ^{10} 5^{3} 9^{10} 18^{2} 19^{23} 23^{13} 29^{25} $30^{16.20}$ 33^{1} 36^{12} 37^{2} 38^{4}: the emendation, the rhythm 3 : 2, which is also unusual though not unparalleled in Job (see 8^{21} 9^{6} $12^{17.19}$ 13^{17} $18^{3.11.18}$ 21^{11} 22^{27} 23^{16} 27^{21} 29^{5} 32^{6} $33^{16.22}$ 36^{14} $37^{1.8.9}$ 38^{9} 39^{3}—several of these doubtful or ambiguous). Out of regard to the first of Bu.'s arguments and to the rhythm, אתה should be omitted; but Bu.'s second and third arguments are very questionable: notice that the fem. אבן is personified as a female in Jer. 2^{27} but as a male in 3^{9}, and that שאול, which is generally fem., is, when personified in Jb. 26^{6}, construed with the masc. adj. Rejecting אתה but retaining אבי we obtain the normal 3 : 3 rhythm, and an effective form of parallelism (a. b. c. ‖ c′ 2. a′) in which the last term of the first line is paralleled by *two* terms at the beginning of the second line without a copula at the beginning of the second line; cf. Is. $43^{3c.d}$. See Gray, *Forms*, p. 77.]

15. ותקותי] 𝔊 τὰ ἀγαθά μου = טוֹבָתִי; 𝔗 מתינתי, 𝔙 *patientiam meam*. The repetition of תקותי is weak [cf. 8^{3} n.]; it is a great improvement to read either וטובתי (Me. Bi. Sgf. Be. Bu. Du.) or וְתַאֲוָתִי (Hi. on Ps. 112^{10}; Wr.) or וְתוֹחַלְתִּי (Hi. here). The change is also strongly supported by v.^{16}, where תרדנה (fem. *plur.*), referring to תקותי alone, is very hard (G-K. 47*k*), but where, with *two* nouns in ^{15}, the difficulty at once disappears. For the type of sentence, cf. 38^{20} וּכְפֹר שמים מי ילדו, Jer. 2^{24} תאותה מי ישיבנה.

16. בדי שאול] the sense *bars* (of a gate; cf. שערי שאול, Is. 38^{10}) is badly supported (the text of Hos. 11^{6} is very dubious), and אם יחד נ׳ yields no satisfactory sense. Ew. Di. al. "when *at the same time* (Ps. 141^{10})—viz. that I with my hope go down into Sheol—*there is rest on the dust* (for my body)" is forced;

and RV. "When *once* there is rest in the dust" is, of course, out of the question. 𝔊 *ἢ μετ' ἐμοῦ εἰς ᾅδην καταβήσονται, Ἢ ὁμοθυμαδὸν ἐπὶ χώματος καταβησόμεθα,* which must be certainly followed with Du. הַעִמָּדִי שאל תֵּרַדְנָה אם יחד על עפר נֵחָת. [נחת is also used of the descent to death in 21[13].]

תרדנה] [not 3rd s.f. of an energetic mood (Ew. 191*c*): see G–K. 47*k*: and cf. v.[15] n.].

CHAPTER XVIII.

2. קִנְצֵי†] from קֶנֶץ*, √ Arab. *ḳanaṣa*, *to take*, *capture*, *ensnare* (an animal), Lane, 2568. For שִׂים, to *set* a snare, cf. Jer. 9[7] ובקרבו ישים אָרְבּוֹ. The *st. c.* before the prep., as 24[5], Is. 56[10] (G–K. 130*a*). [But see next n.]

תשימון] 𝔊 תָּשִׂים; and so [b] תבין, and [3b] עֵינֶיךָ. This is probably right. Ew. Di. Bu. explain the plur. from 17[8f.], where Job seems to widen the issue so as to make it include other righteous men as well as himself. But the terms of 17[8f.] are quite general; and Job nowhere else speaks as the leader, or representative, of a party. Me. Bi. Hfm. Sgf. קֵץ for קנצי, which, as Di. naturally points out, is inconsistent with עד אנה. Du. prefers קץ; and, finding that [2a] is "too long," excises עד אנה, supposing that these words were added (on the analogy of 19[2]) after קץ had been corrupted into קנצי; and so Be.[K]. But 𝔊 already expresses עד אנה; the beginning, תָּשִׂים קֵץ לְמִלִּין, is very abrupt, and the corruption of קץ into קנצי is highly improbable. [The emendations of Du. and Be. can scarcely survive these criticisms. But 𝔐 remains suspicious. Is not (1) תבינו abrupt? Is it altogether satisfactory to emend the strange 2nd plurals of 𝔐 into the 2nd singulars of 𝔊 without taking any account of the remaining differences between 𝔊 and 𝔐? This seems to be one of the cases where 𝔐 and the Hebrew original of 𝔊 differed widely. Instead of the unusual 4 : 3 rhythm (17[14] n.) of 𝔐, 𝔊 immediately suggests an original (1) in the normal rhythm 3 : 3, and (2) yielding a better parallelism than 𝔐, and (3) an admirable sense:

Μέχρι τίνος οὐ παύσῃ;
Ἐπίσχες, ἵνα καὶ αὐτοὶ λαλήσωμεν.

When at last wilt thou cease (talking)?
Leave off (now) that *we* may (begin to) speak.

עד אנה לא (implied by *μέχρι τίνος οὐ*) in the sense, When at last? will you ever? is thoroughly idiomatic; see Jer. 47^{6}, and the synonymous עד מתי לא in 2 S. 2^{26}, Hos. 8^{5}, Zec. 1^{12}. *Ἐπίσχες* might well represent חֲדַל construed without a complementary infin. as in 16^{6} (see *Lex.* 293*b*); *παύσῃ* possibly rendered תִּדֹּם (cf. Jer. 25^{37} 𝔐 and 𝔊).]

ואחר] Du. וַאֲנַחְנוּ (cf. 𝔊 *καὶ αὐτοί*), in agreement with 2a [in 𝔊 (see last n.) and] as corrected by Du., but not as 𝔐.

3. נטמינו] *are defiled* (Nif., as Hos. 5^{3} 6^{10} al.; for נִטְמֵאנוּ, G–K. 75*qq*). But the idea is not what would be expected here. Rashi, נחשבנו טְמוּמִים; Ki. ענין חֲתִימַת הלב ואין דעת; Parchon, נִסְתְּמָה דַּעְתֵּנוּ; cf. Aram. and NH. טמטם, to *stop up*, Is. 33^{15} 𝔗 מטמטם אודנוהי, that *stoppeth* his ears; *Yoma*, 39^{a} sin מְטַמְטֶמֶת לבו של אדם. Hence Schl. Di. De. (from טָמָה = טָמַם), Bu., better, reading (with 3 MSS) נִטְמֵּנוּ, *we are obtuse, stupid.* 𝔊 *σεσιωπήκαμεν*; hence Bi. Be. נִדְמִינוּ, *are put to silence* (?), Ps. $49^{13.\ 21}$ (?).

4. טרף נפשו באפו] the syntax, though Be. says he can make nothing of it, is perfectly simple; טרף נפשו באפו may be either a *casus pendens*, resumed by a sf. in the 2nd pers., instead of the more usual 3rd (Dr. 197), for the sake of the pointed address to Job; or טרף נפשו באפו may be a vocative itself, like 2 K. 9^{31} השלום זמרי הרג אדניו (RV. "Is it peace, thou Zimri, thy master's murderer?" Cf. RV. here, "Thou that tearest thyself in thine anger," etc.). Cf. on 12^{4}.

תֵעָזֵב אָרֶץ] see on 3^{2}, and G–K. 51*n*.

ממקמו] 𝔊 *ἐκ θεμελίων* = מִמּוֹסָדָיו (Ps. 18^{8}, Dt. 32^{22}), preferred by Du. as צור יעתק ממקמו has occurred already (14^{18}).

5. [רשעים] read רשע (𝔙): note the sing. suffixes following.]

שביב †] Aram.: Dn. 3^{22} 7^{9}; Gn. $15^{17\ Ps.-J.}$ (the only reference in Levy); in Syr. Jb. 41^{10}, once in Ephr. and lexx. (PS.).

7. יֵצְרוּ] for יֵצְרוּ (√ צָרַר); G–K. 67*dd*. Cf. in the sg. Pr. 4^{12} בלכתך לא־יֵצַר צעדך.

ותשליכהו] 𝔊 *σφάλαι* (Thackeray, *Gramm.* 286) *δέ* (strictly = וְתַכְשֵׁל; *Ἀ σφαλείη* = תִּכָּשֵׁל) points to וְתַכְשִׁילֵהוּ; so Di. Bi. Be. Bu. ("agrees better with the figure").

8. ברגליו] 9 MSS, 𝔊𝔖𝔙 רַגְלוֹ (subj. to שֻׁלַּח; G–K. 145*o*), and so Du. שֻׁלְּחָה ברשת רַגְלוֹ, which may be right; see, however, Jg. 5^{15} בָּעֵמֶק שֻׁלַּח ברגליו. Still the double ב here (ברשת ברגלו) is not an elegancy.

שבכה] only so here: elsewhere a *lattice*, 2 K. 1^{2}, or a *network* ornament on the pillars of the Temple, 1 K. 7^{17} al. Cf. Arab. *shabaket*, used now by the *fellaḥin* of Palestine to denote a *bird-net* (*PEF QS*, 1905, 38).

יתהלך] G–K. 54*k*.

9. בְּעָקֵב] Rd. with Bi.[1] Sgf. Be. Bu. Du. בַּעֲקֵבוֹ.

יחזק] Rd. יַחֲזֵק; and cf. on 13^{27} and v.[12]. החזיק על only here; usually החזיק ב׳.

צמים] 5^{5} †; see note there. The precise mng. is uncertain (NH. צִמְצֵם is to *press*; *v.* Levy); but the context favours strongly some kind of trap or net. The versions confuse with צְמֵאִים, or paraphrase (𝔊 διψῶντας; 𝔖 צהונא, 𝔙 sitis; 𝔗[1] ביבריא, *the cage*, 𝔗[2] נִבְרַיָּא, the *uprooters*, Levy (*ChWB*. ii. 87).

10. מַלְכֻּדֶת] only here; but the √ לכד is used of catching in a trap or net: Am. 3^{5}, Ps. 35^{8} al.

11. והפצהו לרגליו] Very graphic: wherever he goes, at every step, these "spectral" terrors pursue him, and scare him further. Notice both the pf. with the וְ cons., implying what is *constantly* taking place; and הפיץ, to *scatter*, applied properly to a *body* of people, but here to an individual. *If* a change is deemed necessary, the best conjectures are וְהִקִּיפוּ על רגליו (Voigt), and (Bu.) וְהָדְפֻהוּ לרגלו, as v.[18].

לרגליו] idiom. for *at every step*; lit. *according to* (*Lex.* 516*b*) *his feet* (or *foot*), guided by them, following them closely; cf. Gn. 30^{30} (RV. *whithersoever I turned*, cf. 33^{14} לרגל המלאכה), 1 S. 25^{42}, Is. 41^{2} (RV. 2nd marg.), Hab. 3^{5}.

12. יהי] Rd. יהיה; cf. on v.[9]. In a description of facts, a *wish* is quite out of place; but 𝔊 renders by optatives in vv.[7a. b. 8b. 9a. 11a. b. 13a. 14a. b. 17a. 18a]; so it is possible that scribes, disregarding the context, considered—though not consistently—these references to the fate of the wicked to be not *descriptions*, but *wishes*, and that יהי for יהיה is the work of such a scribe.

רָעֵב אֹנוֹ] (1) his strength (v.^{7}) is *famished*, fig. for enfeebled, undermined; so EVV. ("hungerbitten"), Ew. Di.; (2) his trouble (from אָוֶן, 5^{6}; || אֵיד) beginneth to hunger (so Bu.; יהיה רָעֵב), viz. for him, Del. Hi. Bu. Du. (reading אָוֶן לוֹ for אֹנוֹ). רָעֵב, however, does not occur elsewhere in the sense of *ravenous for*; and should we not, had this been the sense, have expected יִרְעַב לוֹ אוֹנוֹ? (cf. וְלַלֶּחֶם לֹא נִרְעָב, Jer. 42^{14}; לֹא רָעָב לַלֶּחֶם, Am. 8^{11}).

13. 𝔐 "it consumeth the limbs of his skin, the first-born of death consumeth his limbs." The parallelism is here both incomplete and weak; and as בדים (41^{4}† of the limbs of a crocodile) means elsewhere *poles* (Ex. 25^{13} etc.), or *rods* (shoots) of a tree (Ezk. 17^{6} 19^{4}), it will signify *separate extended* limbs, not mere pieces of flesh, so that the "limbs of his *skin*" (EVV. quite gratuitously, "of his *body*") is a strange expression. Wr. Be. Bu. in [a] יֵאָכֵל בִּדְוַי עוֹרוֹ, *i.e.* "*through sickness* his skin *is consumed*, the first-born of death consumeth his limbs": דְּוַי, as עֶרֶשׂ דְּוָי, Ps. 41^{4}, cf. Jb. 6^{7}†; also דַּוָּי (of the heart), Is. 1^{5}, Jer. 8^{18}, La. 1^{22}†; and מַדְוֶה, Dt. 7^{15} 28^{60}† (the "diseases of Egypt"). Du. strikes out ^{13a} as an inferior variant of ^{13b}, and ^{14a} as interrupting the connexion between ^{13b} and ^{14b}, and probably originally a marginal gloss on ^{15a}: he thus gets, for $^{13-14}$, the distich יאכל בדיו בכור מָוֶת תצעדהו למלך בלהות.

14. מִבְטַחוֹ] in apposition to אהלו—his tent, in which he had expected to be always secure. Cf. 8^{14} ובית עכביש מבטחו. 𝔊 ἐκραγείη δὲ ἐκ διαίτης (see on 5^{3}) αὐτοῦ ἴασις (= מַרְפֵּא).

ותצעדהו] the subj. must be the doom described in the previous words; cf. 4^{5} (the trial); Ps. $69^{11.32}$ (the actions previously described); Is. 7^{7} 14^{24} (the plan spoken of); Kö. iii. 323*f*; G–K. 144^{b}. But יַצְעִדֻהוּ would be only a slight change; see then on v.^{18} and 7^{8}. [Or the line may be more seriously corrupt: note for למלך בלהות 𝔙 has *quasi rex, interitus* (as subj. of the vb.), 𝔖 בלהות מלך (as subj.).]

15. מִבְּלִי לוֹ] The מן is partitive (so Hi. Di. Bu. rightly; *Lex.* 580*b*; 2 S. 11^{24} וימותו מעבדי המלך), (things) of (what are) not his ("Nicht ihmgehöriges," Bu.); for the omission of the relative, cf. 39^{16} הקשיח בניה לְלֹא־לָהּ, Hab. 2^{6} הוֹי הַמַּרְבֶּה לֹא־לוֹ. The pred. תשכן is in the fem., on account of the collective idea

implied in מבלי לו (G–K. 145*k*), the allusion being, not to men, but to weeds and wild animals such as are found in deserted ruins. 𝔊 (Θ) for מבלי־לו, ἐν νυκτὶ αὐτοῦ = בְּלֵילוֹ; Voigt, Be. לִילִית, the night-hag supposed to haunt desolate sites (Is. 34^{14}†); Du. בְּלִיַּעַל, which he renders *Unheilbarkeit*, "incurability" (cf. Ps. 41^{9}), and by which he supposes leprosy to be meant, in particular the kind that affected houses, and made them uninhabitable (Lv. $14^{33ff.}$).

17. על פני חוץ] cf. 5^{10} וְשֹׁלֵחַ מים על פני חוצות (‖ ארץ, as here). Del. [also compares Pr. 8^{26} עד לא עשה ארץ וחוצות, where 𝔊 renders ארץ וח' by χώρας καὶ ἀοικήτους: so here 𝔖 renders ܥܠ ܐܦܝ ܡܕܒܪܐ, over the face of the steppe; thus, in antithesis to ארץ, which here and in 30^{8} signifies the cultivated, settled country, חוץ is the steppe country; Del. compares الارض البرّيّة (cf. 𝔖 as just cited) the steppe, the regular antithesis to الارض العامرة, the cultivated country].

18. יהדפֻהו . . . ינִדֻהו] the plur., as 4^{19} 6^{2} 7^{8} etc. (G–K. 144*g*; and on 4^{19} 7^{8}). 𝔊 in ᵇ (ᵃ omitted), 𝔙 in both clauses, express the sg.; 𝔖𝔗 the plur. Du. prefers the sg., supposing God to be referred to. But the hostility of men is here more suitable.

19. נין] Is. 14^{22}, Gn. 21^{23}†; the verb Ps. 72^{17} יָנִין, Kt.; יִנּוֹן, Qrê (si vera l.)†.

נכד] Is. 14^{22}, Gn. 21^{23}†, apparently akin to Eth. *nagad*, *gens*, *stirps* (usually = φυλή); = δῆμος = משפחה, Nu. 4^{24} al.; = γένος, Lv. 21^{18}; Di. *Lex.* 695. נין and נכד also occur in Sir. 41^{5} 47^{22}.

שריד] *fugitive* or *survivor*, after a defeat (so mostly) or other disaster (Nu. 21^{35}, Dt. 2^{34}, Jos. 8^{22} $10^{20.28}$, 2 K. 10^{11} al.; La. 2^{22} לא היה . . . פָּלִיט וְשָׂרִיד; שָׂרַד once, Jos. 10^{20}); Arab. *sharada* is to *take fright and run away* (of an animal). EVV. *remaining*, *that remaineth*, are inadequate.

מגוריו] *his sojourning-places*; cf. מְגוּרָם, Ps. 55^{16} (?). 'מ otherwise only in the sense of "sojourning," in the expressions (P) ארץ (שני ימי) מגורים; cf. בֵּית מְגוּרָי, Ps. 119^{54}.

20. אחרנים וקדמנים] Is the meaning *the hinder ones* and

the front ones, *i.e.* those in the W. and those in the E. (so Ew. Hi. De. Di. Du.; cf. הים האחרן, *the Hinder Sea*, of the Mediterranean Sea, Dt. 11²⁴ 34², Jl. 2²⁰, Zec. 14⁸, and הים הקדמוני, *the Front Sea*, of the Dead Sea, Ezk. 47¹⁸, Jl. 2²⁰, Zec. 14⁸)? or *the later ones* (cf. Qoh. 4¹⁶, and דר אחרון, Ps. 48¹⁴ al.) *and the former ones* (cf. 1 S. 24¹⁴), the later and the former generations, *i.e.* (Hirz. Schl. and other older scholars) the remoter posterity and their ancestors,—the latter being the contemporaries of the wicked man who witnessed his fate, or (Bu.) learnt of it in Sheol (cf. Is. 14^{9f.}). It is true the adjj. אחרנים and קדמנים are not used elsewhere of the dwellers on the W. and E., but the "Hinder Sea" and the "Front Sea" seem sufficient support for the interpretation; while to understand *the former ones* (in contrast to *the later ones*) of persons contemporary with the wicked man himself places an unnatural sense upon the expression.

אָחזו שָׂעַר] see on 3⁸.

21. אך] cf. Ps. 58¹².

אלה] = such as these; cf. Ps. 73¹² הנה אלה רשעים; and זה, c. 20²⁹.

מְקוֹם] G-K. 130*d*.

CHAPTER XIX.

2. תְּגְיוּן] Hif. from יָגָה (cf. יָגוֹן, *sorrow*, Ps. 13[3] al.); G–K. 75*u*, *gg*, end.

וּתְדַכְּאוּנַּנִי] so Kit.: on the -נּ- (here with euphonic dagesh in the נ), G–K. 60*e* (cf. Is. 60[7. 10]). Baer with 𝔅 וּתְדַכְּאוּנַנִי, with quiescent א (one of the 48 words written with quiescent א, Baer, p. 44, *Ochlah we-ochla*, No. 103), G–K. 23*c*, 75*oo*, cf. 74*i*; Ginsb. Kt. וּתְדַכּוּנַנִי, Qrê וּתְדַכְּאוּנַנִי (without dag. in the נ).

3. זֶה] adverbial (Nu. 14[22]; *Lex*. p. 261*b*).

לא־תבשו תהכרו לי] construction, as 32[22], Is. 42[21]; G–K. 120*c*.

תהכרו] from הָכַר † = Arab. *hakara*, to *be filled with wonder* (cf. AW. Ki. *wonder at me*); hence Del., תהכּרו being taken as Hif. (G–K. 53*n*), and ל in לי as the *nota accus.* (on 5[2]), *ye amaze me*. 3 MSS תַּחְכְּרוּ, from חָכַר † = Arab. *ḥakara*, to *wrong*, *detract from*; so Ew. Ges. Bu. Du. David Ḳimchi states that his father Joseph explained תהכרו לי by תָּעֵזּוּ פניכם לי, *harden your faces at me*, since *hakara* in Arab. meant עַזּוּת פָּנִים; and this is the source of AVm. *harden yourselves against me*, AV. *deal hardly with me*. 𝔊 οὐκ αἰσχυνόμενοί με ἐπίκεισθέ μοι, whence Be. תַּכְּלִרוּ; cf. on 6[27b] (𝔊 ἐνάλλεσθε).

4. שגיתי . . . תלין] a hypoth. sentence, without אם: see on 7[20].

5. עלי תגדילו] הגדיל על, as Ps. 55[13] al.; the Hif., as G–K. 53*f*.

6. דְּעוּ] see on 15[23].

עותני] עִוֵּת is to *make crooked* (Qoh. 7[13]), *pervert* balances, Am. 8[5]; judgment, Jb. 8[3]: here with a personal obj., as La. 3[36] לְעַוֵּת אדם בְּרִיבוֹ, and Ps. 119[78] כי שקר עִוְּתוּנִי, for they have lyingly *subverted me* (in judgment).

מְצוּדוֹ] from מָצוֹד, Qoh. 7^{26}, a hunting-implement, by usage, a *net*; so מְצוֹדָה, Qoh. 9^{12} (for fish) †; מְצוּדָה, Ezk. 12^{13} 17^{20}, Ps. 66^{11}.

10. וָאֵלַךְ] G–K. 69*p*.

11. וַיַּחַר] In Hif. only here. It is not necessary; and very probably וַיִּחַר should be read.

כְּצָרָיו] 𝔊 ὥσπερ ἐχθρόν, 𝔖 כְּצַר, 𝔙 כְּצָרוֹ.

13. מֵעָלַי] idiomatic with verbs expressing *separation from* (lit. *from attachment to*; see on 1 S. 28^{15}; *Lex.* 759*a*); here, *from companionship with*.

הִרְחִיק] 𝔊 (ἀδελφοί μου ἀπέστησαν) 'ΑΣ𝔖 הרחיקו (intrans., as Gn. 44^{4}); so Me. Wr. Bi. Sgf. Be. Bu. Du. [Note the pl. in the ||, and that 𝔐 may easily have arisen through haplography of the ו; but Di. prefers 𝔐 with הרחיק trans., and God (as in v.[11]) the subj., and treats 𝔊 as due to dittography. With 𝔐 cf. Ps. $88^{9.\,19}$.]

אַךְ זָרוּ] are *only*, *wholly*, estranged from me: אך, as Dt. 16^{15} והיית אך שָׂמֵחַ, 28^{29} אך עשוק וגזול; Is. 16^{7} 19^{11} אך אֱוִלִים שׂרי צען; 𝔊 (one rendering) ἀνελεήμονες = אכזרו (though no *verb* אכזר is known), which, however, is not consistent with ממני.

14. This v. is short; v.[15a] is longer than would be expected; hence Kenn. Me. Bi. Wr. Be. read חדלו קרובי וּמְיֻדָּעַי שכחוני גרי ביתי. On the other hand גרי ביתי goes with אמהתי better than in [14b] with שכחוני and parallel to קרובי ומידעי. Du., deciding similarly, proposes מִדֵּעַי, "cease *from knowing me*"; but this is quite unnecessary. דֵּעַ, *knowledge*, occurs in Elihu's speeches ($32^{6.\,10.\,17}$ 36^{3} 37^{16}); but מִדֵּעַי for מִדַּעְתִּי is unparalleled. [By itself v.[14] might perhaps stand: the rhythm (2: 2: Gray, *Forms*, p. 159 ff.) and the parallelism (a. b || b′ a′; *ib.* 64 f.) are in themselves admirable, and, outside Job, common: even in Job, 10^{6} is an instance, and a very few others might perhaps be found; but v.[15] is intolerable, and the verse division of [14f.] can scarcely be correct.]

15. תַּחְשְׁבֻנִי] for the *fem.* with 𝔐, see G–K. 146*e*, end; Kö. 349*t* (Ezk. 35^{10a}; but in Jer. 44^{25} rd. אתנה הנשים); with גרי ביתי removed to v.[14] the syntax is normal.

בְּעֵינֵיהֶם] the masc. sf., referring (if גרי ביתי be removed to

[14]) to אמהתי alone, is a frequent anomaly; G–K. 135*o*. On the ה in אמהתי, see on 2 S. 6[20].

17. זָרָה] not זָרָה, and consequently 3 pf. fem.; cf. [13] זָרוּ. Hi. Du. al. *is abhorrent to*, from זור = (not زار, but) ذار (Dr. § 178), *fastidivit*, *abhorruit*, c. acc. rei (Freyt.); but as ذار is transitive, this would yield a wrong sense, *abhors* instead of *is abhorrent to*. The rendering *is strange* (De. Di.) is sufficient. Jer. "halitum meum *exhorruit uxor mea*," paraphrasing.

וחנתי] RV. *my supplication*. But חנן is to *shew favour*, or *be gracious*—even in the same anomalous form of the inf., which, if RV. were right, would be used here, Ps. 77[10] הֲשָׁכַח חַנּוֹת אֵל; it is only the *Hithp.* which means to *supplicate* (lit. to *get* or *seek* favour for oneself; G–K. 54*f*), and *supplication* is תְּחִנָּה. In Arab. خنّ (conj. x.) is *foetorem emisit*, and Syr. ܚܢܝܢܐ is *rancid* (PS. 1315*a*); hence *I am offensive*, RVm. with Ew. Schl. De. Di. Bu. etc. חַנֹּתִי (*mil'el*) will be the pf. with ו cons., with freq. force (as Ex. 33[19] וְחַנֹּתִי את אשר אָחֹן, and regularly with verbs ע״ע), like 16[12b]; though there are a few cases (Dt. 32[41], Is. 44[16], Ps. 17[3] 92[11] 116[6]) in which the 1 pf. of these verbs is anomalously *mil'el* even without the ו cons. (see Del. here, and G–K. 67*ee*). Du. וְצַחֲנָתִי (Jl. 2[20]), *and my stink*; but this will agree only with the doubtful *be abhorrent to* for זרה in [a].

18. עֲוִילִים] 21[11]† [not 16[11]; see n. there]. To be explained, it seems (cf. Wetzst. *ap.* Del. here; Lane, 2200[a], 2201[b–c]), from Arab. *'āla* (med. و), to *feed*, *nourish*, or *sustain one's family* or *household*; whence *'ayyil*, pl. *'iyāl*, *a'yāl*, *the persons whom a man feeds and supports*, as *his young man*, or *slave*, *his wife*, *and his young child*, "among all tribes of the Syrian desert, used of children generally, without distinction of age" (Wetzst. *ZDMG* xxii. (1868) p. 128). R. Levi's statement in *Breshith Rabba*, c. 36 (cited by Del.), is interesting: בערביא צווחין ליניקא עוילה, "In Arabic they call children עוילה." (Not from עול = غال, to *suck*.)

אקומה וַיְדברו בי] I would arise! and they speak against me. A very anomalous form of hypothetical sentence, but

analogous to 3^{25a} 9^{20b} 23^{18b}, the cohortative only making the first verb more graphic.

19. וזה־אהבתי נהפכו בי] The relative omitted after זה, as 15^{17}; and זה construed with a pl. verb. Not so elsewhere; but זה is conceived as a collective (cf., with אחר, 8^{19}), as it is implicitly in Jg. 20^{16} כָּל־זֶה קֹלֵעַ בָּאֶבֶן, ^{17} כל זה איש מלחמה, Lev. $11^{4.9}$ (*Lex.* 260*b*).

20. 𝔊 ἐν δέρματί μου ἐσάπησαν [רָקְבָה] αἱ σάρκες μου, Τὰ δὲ ὀστᾶ μου ἐν ὀδοῦσιν [^{A} ὀδύναις] ἔχεται. 'Α. = 𝔐, Σ^{a} = 𝔐; Σ^{b} καὶ ἐξέτιλλον (thinking of מרט, Me., or cf. Eth. **መለጠ :** *deradere*, **ተመለጠ :** *deradi, depilari*, Ezk. 29^{18} (Di. 154), Be.) τὸ δέρμα μου ὀδοῦσιν ἐμοῖς. Hupf. (1853) in ^{b} conjectured (after Σ) עור בשני, And I escaped "with the skin, *i.e.* the life, in my teeth (cf. 13^{14} אשא בשרי בשני) = with the bare life"; so Wr., but reading better עורי, "And I carry my skin in my teeth"; Me. בעורי בשרי רָקְבָה וְאתמלטה בְּשִׁנַּי עֲצָמָי, "Within my skin my flesh rotteth, And I escape, with my bones in my teeth"; Bi.^{1} Bu. בעורי דבקה עצמי ואתמלטה בְּשָׂרִי בשני, My bone cleaveth to my skin, And I am escaped (with) my flesh in my teeth; Bi.^{2} בעורי דבקה עצמי ותתמלטן שִׁנָּי; Be. בבשרי דבקה עצמי ואתמלטה בעור שִׁנָּי (^{b} "and I am *become hairless* in the skin of my teeth," עור שני denoting the lips and cheeks, and אתמלטה being explained from the Eth. *malaṭa*, cited above); Du. בעורי בְּשָׂרַי רָקְבָה ויתמלטו שִׁנָּי (in ^{a} = Me.; in ^{b} "and my teeth have slipped out (haben sich davon gemacht)," omitting בעור with 𝔊, and following substantially Bi.^{2}; בְּשָׂרִים as Pr. 14^{30}, and the fem. רקבה by G–K. 145*k*). Of these emendations, that of Bi.^{1} Bu. deviates least from 𝔐; it is undoubtedly the best. [That עצמי, as in Bu.'s emendation and also in 𝔖, and not as in some of the other emendations, בשרי is the subj., is favoured by the *fem.* vb. (דבקה, or, after 𝔊, רקבה). In, *e.g.*, Gn. 9^{4} בשר is clearly masc.: this is in accordance with the general rule that parts of the body other than those that exist in pairs are masc. (G–K. § 122 n.: more fully Albrecht in *ZATW*, 1896, p. 72 ff.); and there is no evidence that בשר was ever used as fem. On the other hand, though the same general rule would lead us to expect that עצם, like عَظْمٌ,

would be masc., and in 2 S. 21[12], Jer. 8[1f.], Ezk. 37[5.6.8] masc. suffixes are used in reference to the *pl.* (cf. n. on v.[15]), in Jb. 30[30] עצם is construed with the 3rd sing. fem. of the verb (חרה) as it is also in Ps. 102[6] (closely similar to the present), and the pl. is construed with the fem. pl. of the vb. in Is. 66[14], Ezk. 37[3], Ps. 35[10] 51[10]. In Syr. ܥܛܡܐ is fem. but it means *thigh*, and is, therefore, fem. according to the rule that parts of the body occurring in pairs are fem.]

21. אתם רעי] cf. אחותנו אַתְּ, Gn. 24[60] [*preceding* an impv.].

22. אל] [here, as in 55 other passages in Job (*Lex.* 42*b*), means *God*: it is not, as in 1 Ch. 20[8], an alternative orthography for אֵלֶּה (Saad.), nor to be emended to אֵיל (Reiske, Perles, Be.[T]), or כְּאֵל (Neubauer, *Athenæum*, 1885 (June), p. 823)].

23. מי יתן] with impf., as 6[8] 13[5] 14[13]; only here with וְ.

בַּספר] prefixed to the verb for emph. "In *a* book," as 1 S. 10[25], Ex. 17[14]; G–K. 126*s*.

מי יתן (2)] represented in 𝕲 by τεθῆναι δὲ αὐτά (against Be.).

יֻחָקוּ] the non-pausal form would be יֻחֲקוּ (with d. f. implic. in ח), an Aramaizing form for the regular יוּחַקּוּ; the non-duplication of the ק implying the implicit duplication of the ח (cf. הֻמַּכּוּ, 24[24]; וַיַּכְּתוּ, Dt. 1[44]). See Kö. i. p. 375; G–K. 67*y*. Be. weakens the verse effectively by reading מי יתן (or Be.[K] ויחקו מלי בספר) אפו ויכתבן ובספר יחקו מלי; Du. reads מי יתן אפו ויכתבן מלי בְּסִפְרוֹ יחקו, also disimproving it. Bu. says justly that no change is needed [; but the rhythm (4 : 3) of 𝔐, though not unparalleled (17[14] n.), is unusual].

24. ועפרת] Bu. בעפרת "*in* lead," on the ground that the custom of running molten lead into the characters engraved on the rock to give them greater clearness and permanence is not known, as Di. admits, to have been in use in antiquity. This sense is also expressed by 𝔙 stylo ferreo et plumbi lamina. Di. inclines to it, and thinks it is probably what the poet intended, but sees that 𝔐 does not express it. But the change necessitates the insertion of או before לעד.

לָעַד] prefixed for emph. Θ Me. Hfm. Be. לָעֵד.

[יִתְחַצָּבֶן] with ַ, although in pause, like יִקָּפֵצוּ, 24[24] (Baer, p. 45). The Or. reading is יחצבן (*ib.* p. 57), like יִבָּהֵלוּ, Ps. 104[29], the regular pausal form in Nif. (G–K. 51*m*, end).

25. [ידעתי גאלי חי] For the absence of כי after ידע, see also, *e.g.*, 30[23], Am. 5[12].]

[גאלי חי ואחרון] 𝔊 *ἀέναός ἐστιν ὁ ἐκλύειν με μέλλων.* It is very precarious to argue that 𝔊 disregarded ואחרון (Me.). Elsewhere *ἀέν.* renders עולם (Gn. 49[26], Dt. 33[15. 27]); it may, therefore, here render the two words חי ואחרון which, taken together, might be regarded as synonymous with עולם, whereas חי by itself asserts, directly, less than *ἀέναος*. Or, if the order of 𝔊 may be pressed, 𝔊 may have read חי גאלי ואחרון and rendered חי by *ἀέναος*, and גאלי ואח', or perhaps ג' א', by *ὁ ἐκλύειν με μέλλων* (see Be. with references there). There is, it is true, another consideration that might point to one of these words being intrusive; the rhythm of 𝔐 appears to be 4 : 3, for גאלי חי cannot easily be taken as a single stress, and 4 : 3 in Job is infrequent and suspicious (17[14] n.). We could obtain an unmistakable 3 : 3 rhythm by omitting חי ו, then גאלי, made for emphasis the obj. of ידע (as האור of וירא in Gn. 1[4]), would be the virtual subj. of יקום. But this would leave the parallelism poorer, and the expression of the whole weaker than in 𝔐. It is best, therefore, to retain 𝔐 especially since the considerations, for what they might otherwise be worth, suggested by rhythm and 𝔊 do not converge: *if* anything was absent from 𝔊, it was ואחרון; *if* anything had to be omitted for rhythm, it would be חי.]

[אחרון] that this is actually a subst. and means *afterman, sponsor* (Be.[K]), is neither proved nor probable; if it were, we should certainly expect אחרוני (‖ גאלי; cf. עדי ‖ שהדי, 16[19]). If correct, it is most probably in the acc. of the state (G–K. 118*n*)—*later on* . . . he will stand up. Sgf. reads אַחֲרֹנִי, Che. (*EBi.* 2475) עֹרְבִנִי (cf. 17[3]), with אקח for יקום below.]

[על־עפר] if virtually = *upon* (*my*) *grave*, עפר is used as in 7[21] 17[16] 20[11] in particular of the dust or soil in which a dead body is laid, *i.e.* the grave. Cf. also 10[9], Ps. 104[29], though these are rather different: in the Ps. עפרם with the personal

suffix occurs, and Sgf. proposes here עֲפָרִי (note the immediately following רי). Che. (*EBi.* 2474 f.) suggests (cf. 1716) *the dust(y* ground of Sheol).]

[יקום] 𝔐 יָקוּם, 𝔊 (ἀναστήσαι, -ει) יָקֵם; 𝔙 de terra *surrecturus sum* scarcely points to a *reading* אקום; see Di. p. 178. יִקֹּם, *he avengeth*, would yield no suitable meaning in the context, though with emendations in the following words it is adopted by Bi.[2] Che. אֶפָּח (see n. on אחרון). On the exact nuance of קום, see the exegetical n. But it is certainly unnecessary to render (We. in *JDT* 16[556]; cf. Che. *EBi.* 2475) *will arise against dust* (*i.e.* Job's friends) on the ground that קום על always means *to rise up against*, *assail*; 1 Ch. 28[2], 2 K. 13[21] show that על may occur in the neighbourhood of קום without combining with the vb. to convey this meaning. Du. reads ויקום, and connects this with v.[26]; but this is not suggested, as he asserts, by the rhythm; without יקום v.[25] is not 3 : 3, the normal rhythm of Job, but rather 2 : 2 : 2, which is in Job quite as unusual (17[1] n.) as 4 : 3, which appears to be the rhythm of 𝔐 (see above on נאלי חי).]

[26. ואחר עורי נקפו זאת ומבשרי אחזה אלוה] uncertain, ambiguous and difficult—especially the words נקפו זאת, which, however taken, seem so improbable that textual corruption at this point at least is almost certain. 𝔊 after ἀναστήσαι (= יקם in v.[25]) continues τὸ δέρμα μου τὸ ἀναντλοῦν (ἀντλουν, ἀνατλουν, συνανατλουν) ταῦτα. παρὰ γὰρ Κυρίου ταῦτά μόι συνετελέσθη: whence it appears that 𝔊 (1) read עורי immediately after יקם—*i.e.* om. ואחר; (2) for ומבשרי read ומשדי (Κύριος = שדי as in 6[14] 22[3. 26]); (3) read אלוה, defectively אלה (so Ken. 603). Whether 𝔊 read נקפו (its first ταῦτα apparently renders זאת) or אחזה, and, if not, what exactly it read instead of these words, is uncertain. It is doubtful whether 𝔖𝔗𝔙 imply a text different from 𝔐: 𝔖 ܘܠܥܠ ܡܫܟܝ ܗܘ ܐܬܟܪܟ; ܘܗܠܝܢ ܘܠܥܠ ܡܒܣܪܝ ܐ ܐܚܙܐ ܠܐܠܗܐ ܒܥܝܢܝ; 𝔗 ומן בתר דאתפח משכי תהי דא ומבסרי אחמי תוב אלהא; 𝔙 et rursum circumdabor pelle mea et in carne mea videbo deum meum. The Hebrew variants are doubtless due to later errors: Ken.[811] ואחרי for ואחר; Ken.[200] om. עורי; Ken.[48] om. אחזה אלוה.]

[ואַחַר עורי] So 𝔐 and all the VV. except 𝔊, which reads עורי but om. ואחר. In 𝔙 ואחר is taken adverbially, in 𝔖𝔗 as a prep. But, as in יקום (v.[25]) and אלוה in [b], the *scriptio plena* in עורי may be later than 𝔊; the *scriptio defectiva* actually occurs elsewhere even in 𝔐 (*e.g.* עִרָה, Nu. 19[5]). Written defectively ערי would be scarcely distinguishable from עדי; consequently it would be very legitimate to read אַחֵר עֵדִי (Bi.[2] Du.) if without further emendation this produced a good distich; but it does not (see next n.). Yet, even though עורי be retained, the ambiguity of אחר remains: it may be (1) an adv., *afterwards* (*e.g.* Gn. 18[5] 24[55], Jg. 19[5] al.), but not *in novissimo die* (𝔙), *at the last day* (AV.), *am jüngsten Tage* (Honth.); or (2) a prep. governing עורי, with a local or temporal force, *behind* (cf. Is. 57[8]), which Ehrlich interprets as *under* (my skin), Bu. as "still enclosed (*umschlossen*) by my skin," *i.e.* still alive, or *after* (as, *e.g.*, 1 K. 19[11f.]), *i.e.* after the disappearance or destruction of my skin; or (3) a conj. = אחר אשר (as 42[7] 𝔐, Jer. 41[16], Lv. 14[43] 𝔐), *after that* (my skin has been destroyed). If עורי is correctly read, it is a parallel term to בשרי in [b] (𝔐, not 𝔊) as in 7[5] (19[20]), and אחר should be parallel in sense to the מן of מבשרי: unfortunately this latter phrase is also ambiguous (see below). If מבשרי means *away from my flesh*, *i.e.* after my body has perished, אחר עורי should have the same meaning; but Bu. raises two objections to this: (1) that אחר is always local when it refers to an *object*, and temporal only when it refers to an *action*: since the idea of passage is more directly suggested there than here, 1 K. 19[11f.] does not perhaps entirely invalidate this; (2) that whereas בשר by itself is often used for the entire body as contrasted with the נפש or לב (*e.g.* 14[22], Ps. 16[9] 63[2]), עור is not, but is used strictly of the outward covering of the body, the skin (30[30], La. 4[8] 5[10], Jer. 13[23]), and combined with בשר requires the latter to be used in its specific sense of the flesh under the skin (7[5]), the two together being contrasted with the inner framework of the body formed by the bones; cf. 10[11] 19[20], and (עור + שאר) Mic. 3[2f.]. If the text could be trusted, in 18[13] עור would have the wider sense of *body*, which Bu. questions.]

[נקפו זאת] the vb. is taken either (1) as the pred. of the

sentence introduced by the *conj.* or *adv.* אחר (see last n.) with the obj. עורי of נקפו prefixed—an emphatic position (cf. Dr. § 208 (1), for which there seems to be no reason here, or (2) as the vb. of a relative sentence qualifying עורי in the *prepositional* phrase—*after my skin which* . . ., the relative particle being omitted according to G-K. 155*b*. In either case נקפו is commonly explained as the 3rd pl. act. corresponding idiomatically to our passive (4^{19} n.). The vb. is, then, Piel of נקף, *to strike off, away*; cf. Is. 10^{34} † (of striking off branches), and the verbal noun נקף of beating olive berries off the tree (Is. 17^6 24^{13}). These comparisons are already made by the mediæval Jewish commentators (Ibn Ezr.; Anon., ed. Wright and Hirsch.). The form might also be Nif., used as a passive of the Hif. (G-K. 51*f*) of נקף, *to go around* (Is. 29^1), in Hif. *to surround* (v.[6] and often). 𝔖𝔙 clearly think of this vb., and Honth. has recently defended this interpretation; but he can account for the pl. only by the very forced suggestion that its subject is זאת used collectively of the bones of the body with the sense of *I*—at the last day I shall be (proph. pf.) surrounded with my skin! Other interpretations of זאת are scarcely less forced: the alternatives are to suppose that it means *this* (will happen)—so 𝔗; or *in this manner* (Del.)—an acc. of manner never elsewhere taken by זה or זאת; or that it is a kind of resumption of עורי; or, since this is masc., a reference, accompaning a gesture, to the body (Di.)—and *after my skin has been struck away*, (viz.) *this* (skin or body).]

[ומבשרו] either *away from my flesh*, or *from my flesh* is, so far as the phrase itself is concerned, equally possible; for the rare but by no means unusual use of מן in the former case, cf. 11^{15} n.]

[The uncertainties and difficulties of 𝔐 in this v. being so great, it is not surprising that attempts at emendation have been numerous and ingenious, if not convincing. Bu., by a very slight change (נִקַּף כְּזֹאת), eliminates at once the awkward pl. נקפו and the impossible זאת, and obtains the distich:

> Within my skin thus struck away,
> And from my flesh, I shall see God;

but that a skin which has been struck away should still enclose the speaker is curious. As an alternative he considers one of the suggestions offered by Be.[T], viz. נִשְׁקַפְתִּי for נקפו זאת, which gives a completer parallelism of terms but a not very probable prophetic pf.:

Within my skin I look out,
And from my flesh I shall see God.

Be.[T]'s other suggestion was נִקְפַּזְתִּי. Bi. also offered two emendations; Bi.[1] (in [b] mainly following 𝔊) proposed

ואחר עֵדִי נָקְפָה זאת
ומשדי אחזה אֱלֹה

which requires at least as much defence and apology as 𝔐. Bi.[2], bringing over יקם (𝔊) from v.[25], reads:

יִקֹּם עדי נִקְמַת זאת
וּמְשָׂרַי אֹחֲזָה אָלָה

My witness [*i.e.* God] will take vengeance for this,
But a curse will seize my adversaries,

cleverly obtained by very slight departures from either 𝔐 or 𝔊; but as Bu. asks: Why אחוה and not תֹּאחֵז, why נקמת זאת instead of the better antithesis נקמתי, and why the unknown Poel of שָׂרָה? And the answer must be that, if the idea were more naturally and normally expressed, the emended text would differ so widely from 𝔐 and 𝔊 as to appear improbable. Du., also by slight changes, obtains the distich:

ויקום אַחֵר עדי
חקף זה אתו:

And another will arise as my witness,
And this one will set up his sign—

understanding the "sign" to be that which he supposes the avenger of blood set up over the corpse of him who was to be avenged. By now combining [26b] with [27a], and [27b] and [c], Du. gets rid of the isolated stichos formed by [27c] if, as is usual, [27a. b] be taken as a distich. But the אתו and זה of Du.'s emendation

are improbable, and [27a] is better paralleled by [27b] (note ראו ‖ אחזה, לי ‖ לא־זר) than by [26b] which has the *same* vb. חזה as [27a]. Che. (*EBi.* 2474*f*):

שדי יָקֵם תאותי
ומצדיקי אחזה אלוה׃

but if the textual evidence is to be so largely disregarded, it would be easy to construct distichs in more exact parallelism. Richter instead of עורי נקפה זאת ומבשרי proposes ערבני יקף אתי ובשהדי—first the *goel* takes his stand on Job's grave (v.[25]), thereafter (ואחר) as his surety (ערבני) lifts him up from the grave. But [a] thus becomes four stressed. יקף אתי for יקפני is very improbable, and so is the *beth essentiæ* in ובשהדי: Be.[K] avoids the last objection, only by proposing an unknown form וּמְשָׂהֲדִי.]

27. אשר אני] no change is needed; but *if* any one inclines to change, Bu. suggests אַשְּׁרֵנִי or אַשְּׁרֵנִי כִּי, "Count me happy, for I shall see him for myself." אַשְׁרֵינִי (Neubauer, Be.[Kit.] alt.), "O my happiness!" is an unheard of form. [The parallelism is at present perfect, ראו ‖ אחזה, עיני ‖ אני, ולא זר ‖ לי: emendations, such as אשרני, or, below, אֵלַי for לי, are improbable.]

ראו] Bu. יִרְאוּ, thinking the pf., especially before כלו, which refers to the present, to be intolerable. Still there are many cases of the perfect "of certitude" being used to express the future (Dr. 14).

ולא זר] the waw is perhaps a dittograph; זר, pf., or part. negatived by לא (*BDB* 519*b*): Job's acquaintances are estranged זרו (v.[13]): God will be seen not to be so: similarly Job's brethren have gone מֵעָלַי (*ib.*); God is לי.]

כלו כליתי בחקי] Wr. כָּלוֹ כָלֵיתִי בְּחֻקִּי, "I am utterly exhausted in my appointed time ($14^{5.\,13}$)"; Klo. כָּלוֹ כָלִיתִי, "I shut up" (from כָּלָא by G-K. 75*qq*),—both extraordinary.

28. לו] the *nota accus.*; cf. on 5^2. (In Jg. 7^{25} rd. את־מדין for אל־מדין).

בי] In 𝕸 there is a change from the direct ([a]) to the indirect narration ([b]), "and *that* the root of the matter is found in me" (without בי, as Gn. 12^{18} 41^{15b}, Jb. $35^{3a.\,14}$ etc.; G-K. 157*a* (*a*)); but the continuation by the direct narrative is much

more forcible, and some 100 MSS, Θ 𝔗𝔙 read בּוֹ; so Mich. Wr. Sgf. Be. Bu. Klo. Du.

29. גורו לכם] The לְ is prob. reflexive (*Lex.* 516*a*); לכם is hardly strong enough to express the emphatic "for yourselves" (which would be rather לנפשכם or לנפשתיכם; cf. Jos. 9^{24b} ונירא לנפשתינו).

[ᵇכי חמה עונות חרב ᶜלמען תדעון שדין (שדון Qrê)] 𝔊 *θυμὸς γὰρ ἐπ' ἀνόμους ἐπελεύσεται, καὶ τότε γνώσονται ποῦ ἔστιν αὐτῶν ἡ ὕλη* (*ἡ ὕλη*, perhaps as though thinking of שָׂדַי; cf. 29^5 *ὅτε ἤμην ὑλώδης λίαν* = בְּעוֹד שַׁדַּי (שָׂדַי) עִמָּדִי); for *ποῦ κτλ.*, ᴬ *ὅτι οὐδαμοῦ αὐτῶν ἡ ἰσχύς ἐστιν* (thinking of שַׁדַּי); 𝔖 ܡܛܠ ܕܡܬܒܥܢܐ ܕܥܘܠܗܘܢ ܚܪܒܐ ܗܘ; 𝔙 quoniam ultor iniquitatum gladius est; for ᶜ 'ΑΣΘ *ὅπως γνῶτε ὅτι* (*ἔστι*) *κρίσις*: so 𝔖 ܕܐܝܬ ܕܝܢܐ, 𝔙 *esse iudicium*, Saad.; 𝔗 for ᶜ מִן בִּגְלַל דְּתִנְדְּעוּן דְּדַיָּין קְשׁוֹט הוּא מָרֵי דִינָא, "that ye may know that the lord of judgement is a truthful judge." In ᵇ Ges. Di.[1] Bu. read הֵמָּה for חֵמָה ("for they—*i.e.* such slanders—are iniquities of (worthy of punishment by) the sword"); Di. כִּי נֹקֶמֶת עונות חרב (for the sword avengeth iniquities); Sgf. כי חמה בְּעַוָּלִים תָּבֹא (after 𝔊; but it is doubtful if *ἀνόμους* is more than a paraphrase); Du. כי חמה עָוֶל תַּחֲרִב (החריב, חרב, though usually said of lands, cities, etc., is at least used of nations in 2 K. 19^{17}, Is. 60^{12}). In ᶜ, for שדין, Hi. לְהָבִין; Sgf. כִּי שָׁדְדוּ (*sc.* the עַוָּלִים of ᵇ); Ew. Reuss, Wr. Di. Be. שַׁדַּי; Bu. לְמַעַן תֵּדְעוּ יֵשׁ דַּיָּן ("that there *is* a judge"); so Klo. (דַּיָּן, as 1 S. 24^{16}, Ps. 68^6 †; יֵשׁ, with some emph., 12 times in Job, *e.g.*, 11^{18} 14^7). De. and most agree with 'ΑΣΘ 𝔖𝔙 (= Kt.), Rabb., and EVV. ("that ye may know there is a judgement") in taking שׁ־ as the rel. particle שׁ־ (usually שֶׁ־, but שַׁ־, Gn. 6^3 (?), Jg. $5^{7.7}$, Ca. 1^7 †) = *that*, as often in Qoh. (*Lex.* שֶׁ־, 3), and דִּין, as the subst. *judgement*. שֶׁ־, however (on its occurrences, see *Lex.* 979), does not occur elsewhere in Job; דין occurs in the Elihu speeches (35^{14} $36^{17.17}$; 36^{31}, the verb), but neither the noun nor the vb. is found elsewhere in Job; and יֵשׁ is desiderated.

CHAPTER XX.

2. לָכֵן] *Therefore*—on account, viz. of what Job has said. 𝔊 οὐχ οὕτως, as though לכן stood for לא־כן (so, but needlessly, Me. Bi. Sgf. Be.), as often in the historical books (Gn. 4^{15} 30^{15}, Jg. 8^{7} 11^{8} *al.*), not perceiving that in such cases *therefore* introduces an answer to a remark, or objection, made by another (*Lex.* 487*a*; Dr. on 1 S. 3^{14} 28^{2}).

שעפי] see on 4^{13}.

ישיבוני] *answer me*: lit. *turn me back* (*sc.* with a word; see on 13^{22}), *answer me*, in the sense of *do not allow me to be silent*, is certainly weak; hence Du., cleverly, יְרְהִיבֻנִי, *bestürmen mich*, *disturb me*; cf. Ca. 6^{5}, Oettli, Buhl (v. *Lex.*); and ܗܘܫ, in Peîl ptcp. = *disturbed* (Mk. 5^{38} = θόρυβον, and Lk. 10^{41} θορυβάζῃ); but usually in the sense of either *alarmed* or *hastening* (so Ethp. *be alarmed*; Af. to *hasten* (trans.) or *alarm*; *v.* PS.).

ובעבור וג׳] rd. ובעבור זאת (Bi.[1] Be.[K] Du.; Di. inclines) or בעבור זה (Ex. 13^{8}); perhaps (Bu.) even וּבַעֲבוּרָהּ would be sufficient (בעבור כן never occurs).

חושי בי] "is my haste—my impetuosity, eagerness—(active) within me." Del. *my feeling*, i.e. *my emotion*, deriving the word not from חוש, to *hasten*, but from חוש, חָשַׁשׁ (= Arab. *ḥassa*, to *feel*, *perceive* by the senses), in Aram. and NH. (see Levy, *ChWB*, *NHWB*, *s.vv.*), to *feel*, in various *nuances*, sometimes to *be anxious*, but mostly to *feel pain*, to *suffer* (in OT. once, Qoh. 2^{25} (so rd.), מי יאכל ומי יָחוּשׁ חוץ ממנו, and who can *feel* (here suggesting *have pleasure*) apart from him? Syr. ܚܫ, *passus est*, *doluit*, *contristatus est* (PS. 1389 f.), ܚܫܐ, *suffering*, often for πάθημα, as Heb. 2^{9}, also of grief, sadness, etc.; in a more neutral sense, of an *affection* of the mind in

general, as of desire, ܚܘܫܐ ܕܪܓܬܐ = πάθος ἐπιθυμίας, 1 Th. 4^5 (*ib.* 1391). Probably therefore חוּשׁ (? חֹשׁ, חֲשִׁי) might in Heb. have been used to denote the general feeling of *emotion*. Be.[K] רָחַשׁ לִבִּי (Ps. 45^2), *is* my heart *astir*; [Richter, אבן for לכן in [a], and for [b] וּבְעֵר יְרַחֵשׁ לִבִּי; but this, though the changes are slight, requires too elaborate a defence to be probable].

3b. But a spirit answers me out of my understanding, *i.e.* a higher spirit (32^8), speaking in, and out of, my understanding, teaches me what the value of Job's protestations is (so Del. Di.). It is objected that this interpretation of מבינתי makes Zophar's own understanding the source of his higher inspiration; hence Hi. Bu., "And wind, (arising) out of my understanding, answers me," *i.e.* the "understanding," or instruction, which I give Job, instead of bringing him wisdom, resolves itself in his mouth into mere wind (cf. "wind," 8^2 15^2 16^3). Du. Be.[K] (after 𝔊, ἐκ τῆς συνέσεως—without μου) מבינה, and with wind *void of understanding*, *thou* answerest me (תענני).

רוח] is frequently masc. (agst. Strahan): 4^{15} 8^2 41^8, Ps. 51^{12} 78^{39}, Is. $57^{18. 16}$.

4. "Dost thou know this (as being) from of old, since the placing of man upon the earth, that . . . ?" *i.e.* Of course thou knowest it! (cf. *Lex.* 210*a*). There is no occasion to read הֲלֹא (Sgf. Du.). 𝔊 μὴ (not οὐ) presupposes הֲ, not הֲלֹא. As usually understood, מני עד וגו׳ is connected not with ידעת (for no man could know this from the creation) but (as rendered) with זאת, as a secondary predicate (so De. Hi. Di.). Bu., thinking this construction awkward, construes differently, supposing the question to be a mocking one, Hast thou this fine windy knowledge (v.[3b]) from the time of creation? (comp. the question of Eliphaz in 15^7), and rendering כי in v.[5] not by *That*, but (exactly as in 22^{2b} after 22^{2a}) *Nay*.

מני] see on 6^{16}.

עד] of *past* time, as Hab. 3^6 †.

שים] inf., with indef. subj., as 13^9. The inf. of שִׂים (Nöld. *Beiträge*, i. 39) is usually שׂוּם, שִׂים elsewhere only Is 10^6 Kt, 2 S. 14^7 Qrê.

5. מקרוב] *recent*; lit. *from what is near*, i.e. *the near* (past); so Dt. 32[17] (EVV. *of late*).

6. †שיאו] שִׂיא, if correct, will be an anomalous form for נְשִׂיא, with elision of נ, from √ נָשָׂא (Kö. ii. 145); cf. כִּילַי, Is. 32[5], for נְכִילַי (Kö. ii. 118). Perhaps שְׂאֵתוֹ (13[11] 31[23]) should be read (the masc. עלה, then by G–K. 145*o*). 𝔊 *αὐτοῦ τὰ δῶρα* (!), thinking of שַׁי; cf. Ps. 68[30] 76[12] 𝔊 (Be.).

7. כגללו] גְּלָלִים, Zeph. 1[17]; גֶּלְלֵי, Ezk. 4[12. 15] †; הַגָּלָל, 1 K. 14[10] †. Lit. *globulus stercoris*; cf. 𝔗 גִּלְּא; Arab. *jillat*[un], *jallat*[un]. The sg. would be גֵּל; cf. צְלָלוֹ, 40[22], צִלְלֵי, from צֵל (Kö. ii. 43; G–K. 93*aa*, *bb*).

8. ימצאהו] [construction as 4[19] (see n. there); 𝔊 *εὑρεθῇ*, whence Bi. Be. נמצא,—doubtful, though rhythmically easier].

יֻדַּד] *is chased away*. The pass. of יְנִדֻּהוּ, 18[18]. 𝔊 (*ἔπτη δὲ*) 𝔖𝔗𝔙 express יִדַּד (cf. Gn. 31[40], of sleep); but ידד is pointed as Hof. to denote the unwillingness of his disappearance.

9. שזפתו] 28[7], Ca. 1[6] †. Without parallel in the cognate languages.

תשורנו] מקום is so constantly masc., that in the three exceptions the text can hardly be right. Here ישורנו can easily be read; the fem. may well be a copyist's error due to the preceding תוסיף (so Di. Be. Bu.). In Gn. 18[24] בְּקִרְבּוֹ may well be the original reading; and in 2 S. 17[12] באחת המקומות, אחת is probably due to the fem. termination of המקומות.

10. בניו יְרַצּוּ דלים] (1) רָצָה is to *be pleased with*, *be favourable to*; hence רִצָּה will be to *make favourable*, *conciliate*; so, I.E. (כי בניו יוצרכו לְרַצּוֹת הדלים שגזל), Ges. *Thes.* 1306*b*, Schl. De. Di.: the sons will be forced to court the favour of the poor (whom, viz., their father had plundered). (2) The Vrss. all see רָצַץ in ירצו: thus 𝔊 *τοὺς υἱοὺς αὐτοῦ ὀλέσαισαν* (as Rosenm. saw, a corruption of cod.[A] *θλάσ(ε)ιαν*: *θλάω* for רָצַץ, as v.[19], Jg. 10[8], 1 S. 12[4] al.; Be.) *ἥττονες*: the order of words, emphasizing the object, as 5[2] 14[19] 15[30], Ps. 11[5b] 139[16] etc. (Dr. 208. 1). (3) 𝔖 His children are broken in poverty; 𝔙 Filii eius atterentur egestate, *i.e.* יֵרֹצּוּ (Nif.); so—though naturally discarding the ungrammatical "in poverty"—Hi. his children are

crushed into poor ones (*verkümmern zu Bettlern*)—accus. of the product (G–K. 117*ii*); Bu. his children are oppressed *as* poor ones (G–K. 118*n*), but in this case (Du.) דלים seems superfluous. Du. regards [10a] as a variant of [19], and [10b] as a gloss on [18].

וידיו תשבנה אונו] reverting to the lifetime of the wicked man, and explaining why his sons are impoverished ([a]): he had to give back the wealth which he had wrongfully gotten to its owners. Hrz. Del. al., to avoid this awkward return to the past, suppose the meaning to be that he gives back his ill-gotten wealth through the hands of his children; but this is unnatural. Bu. would read either וִידֵיהֶם or וִילָדָיו יָשִׁיבוּ—ישיבו being corrected into תשבנה after וילדיו had become וידיו. און, *strength* (18^7) = ***wealth***, as Hos. 12^9; cf. חַיִל, *strength*, also often = ***substance***, ***wealth***, as v.[15].

11. עלומיו] 33^{25}, Ps. 89^{46}, Is. 54^4 †; here = *youthful vigour*, cognate with עֶלֶם (1 S. 17^{56}), עַלְמָה; Arab. غُلْم, *young man*, from غَلِمَ, *to be excited by lust*.

תשכב] viz. (Ew. Di. De. Bu. Du.) עלמיו: the fem. as 12^7 etc. (G–K. 145*k*); cf. Ps. 103^5 תִּתחדש כנשר נעוריכי.

12. תמתיק] *sheweth sweetness* (G–K. 53*d*), or *groweth sweet* (*ib. e*; Ew. § 122*c*) *dulcescere*; see 14^8 n.

14. נהפָּךְ] pf. in pause. The bare pf., introducing the apod., expresses the suddenness of the change (Dr. 136γ).

15. חיל בלע וג׳] a change of expression, for the sake of vividness: the pf. sets the scene before the reader as completed; and the וְי׳ expresses the natural consequence of בלע (Dr. 80).

ירשנו] properly, *to make* (others) *inherit* = to *dispossess*: usually of *dispossessing* the nations of Canaan, Dt. 4^{38} $9^{4.5}$ etc.; hence here fig. *expel*. 𝔊 ἐξ οἰκίας αὐτοῦ (מביתו) ἐξελκύσει αὐτὸν ἄγγελος,—a euphemistic paraphrase for אֵל.

17. אַל] either a strong negative, *Never can he . . .!* (*Nicht darf er . . .!* Di.; cf. G–K. 108*e*), or the poet's feeling leading him to pass from the description of facts (which is what the context logically requires) to the expression of what

he *wishes* may be the fate of the wicked man (Dr. 82). Observe that 𝔊 has optatives in vv.$^{10a.\ b.\ 15\ (c).\ 16.\ 23b.\ c.\ 24b.\ 25.\ 26a.\ c.\ 27.\ 28}$; cf. on 18^{12}.

פלגות] in the sense *canals* only here; elsewhere פֶּלֶג, פלגים (29^6 פלגי שמן; Ps. 1^3 al.).

נהרי נחלי דבש] There are parallels for the suspended *st. c.*, *e.g.* 1 S. 28^7 אֵשֶׁת בַּעֲלַת אוב, Jer. 46^9 תֹּפְשֵׂי דֹּרְכֵי קשת (G–K. 130*e*); but Hupf. Me. Di. al. have conjectured that one of the two synonyms, most probably נהרי, was either a gloss on the other, or (Bu.) a dittograph. בפלגות יִצְהָר (Klo.) is, however, a very probable conjecture [yielding the normal rhythm (3 : 3), instead of the questionable rhythm of 𝔐, or 𝔐 with a word omitted, and a superior parallelism].

18a. ולא] וְ introducing the pred., as 23^{12} 25^5, Is. 57^{12b}, Ps. 115^7 (Dr. 124); but יָגָע occurs nowhere else, and a sf. is desiderated: rd. prob. (Bu.) יְגִעוֹ לא (יגיע, as 10^3 $39^{11.\ 16}$). ולא in ^{b} is similar; but here also the וְ might well be dittographed from תמורתו. 𝔊 for משיב יגע has εἰς κενὰ καὶ μάταια ἐκοπίασαν, as though בַּשָּׁו יָגַע. Du. מַשְׂגֶּה יגע ולא יַבְלִיג תמורתו ולא יעלס, He increaseth (?; Du. compares משך חסד, to *draw out*, *extend*, *prolong*, kindness; but this is hardly parallel) the product of his labour, and doth not brighten up (9^{27} 10^{20}), That which he gaineth by exchange, and rejoiceth not. Bu. in ^{b} כחילו, *i.e.* according to his substance, so is that which he gaineth by exchange, he cannot rejoice.

יעלס] עלס (not עלז or עלץ), as 39^{13}, Pr. 7^{18} †.

19. רִצַּץ] Piel: Ps. 74^{14} lit. (אתה רִצַּצְתָּ ראשי לויתן); 2 Ch. 16^{10} metaph. (וַיְרַצֵּץ מן העם) †.

עזב] Du. עֲצָב, "Verdienst" (rather, as Hfm., *sauer Erwerb* (the product of) *painful toil*, cf. Pr. 5^{10}, Ps. 127^2 לֶחֶם הָעֲצָבִים); but this does not suit רִצַּץ. Be.^{K} ("perhaps") זֶרַע (cf. 22^{9b}). [For the asyndeton in 𝔐, cf. 29^8; Kön. iii. 370*h*. Yet the vb. עזב after רצץ seems anti-climactic.]

בית ג׳] he *hath seized* a house, and *goeth not on to build it* = if he seizeth a house, he will not build it (*i.e.*, through being impoverished, will be unable to renovate it, add to it, and otherwise fit it for his own use; so Ew. Me. Di. Del. Bu.; cf.

for the tenses, Ps. 103[16] (De.). Hi. al. he seized a house, *and built it not* (= instead of building himself one): but the impf. is against this; for though the impf., where separated from וְ cons., is, as Hi. remarks, not unfrequently retained (2 S. 2[28], Jos. 15[63], Dt. 2[12] al.), yet it must in these cases possess its frequentative force, which after גָּזַל would be unsuitable (see Dr. 85, *Obs.* with *n.* 1; and cf. 42β). Du. בית גזל לא בְנָהוּ, he seizeth a house, which he *had not built*; cf. 𝔙 et non ædificavit eam.

גזל] construed with both acc. pers. (= *rob*) and acc. rei (= *take violently away*).

20. שָׁלֵו] 16[12] and elsewhere an *adj.*: rd. שַׁלְוָה (Sgf. Bu.), *ease, quietness, prosperity, e.g.* Pr. 17[1] טוֹב פַּת חֲרֵבָה וְשַׁלְוָה בָהּ מִבַּיִת מָלֵא זִבְחֵי רִיב; cf. Is. 59[8] לא ידע שלום. Bu., doubting בבטנו, proposes בטנו—כי לא ידע שלוה בִּטְנוֹ being the subj., the masc. ידע by G–K. 145*o*. 𝔊 οὐκ ἔστιν αὐτοῦ σωτηρία τοῖς ὑπάρχουσιν, whence Me. כי לא יֶשַׁע לוֹ בְּטֻבָיו (rather בְּטוּבוֹ, the pl. טֻבִים not occurring); Du. לֹא שָׁלֵו בְּמַטְמֹנוֹ, hath no quietness in his treasure (Gn. 43[23]).

בחמודו] *his valued possessions.* The pass. ptcpp. of חָמַד, and derivatives, denote not so much what one *delights in* (EVV.), as what is *desired* or *coveted*, sometimes on account of its attractiveness (Ps. 39[12], Is 44[9]), sometimes, in particular, on account of its value; hence the idea which they suggest in the latter case is that of *precious*; cf. Pr. 21[20] אוֹצָר נֶחְמָד = *costly* treasure; מַחְמָד, *precious* things, *valuables*, Hos. 9[6]; כְּלִי חֶמְדָּה, *precious* things, Hos. 13[15], Nah. 2[10 (9)]. EVV. *pleasant* does not express the real meaning of the Heb.

יְמַלֵּט] The Pi. is transitive (in Am. 2[15a] either the obj. to יְמַלֵּט follows in [b] נפשו, or יִמָּלֵט must be read): it is too much to supply נַפְשׁוֹ (Du.): read therefore יִמָּלֵט (Sgf. Be. Bu.). 𝔊(Θ)𝔖𝔗 all render by a passive. EVV. "shall not save aught of . . ." would be מֵחֲמוּדוֹ לֹא יְמַלֵּט.

21. לאכלו] *his eating,*—not from אֹכֶל, but from the inf. אֱכֹל.

יחיל] *is strong,* and so *firm, stable*; so Ps. 10[5] †. From חִיל, the √ of חַיִל, *strength,* hence *capability, wealth,* etc. (*Lex.*

298*b*). The same √ is found in Aram., in the Pael חַיֵּל, to *strengthen*, and in Eth. *ḥêla*, *ḥayala*, to *be strong*.

22. במלאות] G–K. 74*h*; cf. 75*oo*, *qq*.

שִׂפְקוֹ] from שֶׂפֶק †; the verb שָׂפַק, 1 K. 20^{10} † (c. 36^{18} is doubtful). The √ is common in Aram.

עָמֵל] as 3^{20}. The word is, of course, collective: Du.'s argument that we must read עָמָל with 𝔊 (*πᾶσα δὲ ἀνάγκη*; cf. 𝔙 omnis dolor), "because otherwise we should have had עֲמֵלִים," is not sound. Bu. also reads עָמָל (though not on Du.'s ground), thinking that 𝔐 "hardly yields a possible sense," and that the "hand," implying the personification of עָמָל (cf. מִידֵי חֶרֶב, 5^{20} etc.), led to the false punctuation עָמֵל. But the change is not needed. 𝔖 עָוֶל.

23. יהי וג׳] Difficult. (1) Ew. 345*b*, end; Del. "It will be, in order to fill his belly, that He (God) will send," etc. (analogous to 2 K. 17^{25} וַיְהִי . . . וַיְשַׁלַּח, in past time, Del.); but *it will be*, in spite of 18^{12} (see note there), implies יהיה: יהי can only mean *may it be* . . ., and, if original, must indicate (cf. on v.[17] אַל) that the poet's feeling leads him to express the *wish* that such may be the fate of the ungodly. (2) Di., regarding (1) as in poetry heavy, says that it "seems preferable" to subordinate יהי to ישלח, and renders, "that it (his anger) may serve to fill his belly, he must send his anger," etc.; this rendering gives יהי its proper force, but the inversion is unnatural. (3) May he (the wicked man) be *for one* (הַמְמַלֵּא; cf. on 3^{20}) *to fill* (= that one may fill) his belly! May He (God) send, etc.; or reading יהיה for יהי, He will be (or He is,—freq., like the other impff. in the ch.) for one to fill his belly; He will send (or He sends), etc. (cf. Hi.). (4) Da. His belly shall be filled! (rather, with 𝔐, may his belly be filled!), lit. *be for filling*, היה ל: Dr. § 203: the masc. verb by G–K. 145*o*. (5) Wr. Bu. יהוה for יהי: Yahweh, that He may fill his belly, sends, etc.; but יהוה is so studiously avoided in the dialogue (only in 12^{9}), that to assume it here is questionable; nor is the subordination of למלא בטנו, though perfectly grammatical, quite in the style of poetry. (6) 𝔊 om. יהי למלא בטנו: so Me. Bi. Be., as a gloss on בלחומו, Du. as a gloss on [22a] (?). [An alternative is

to regard these words as the corrupt fragment of a distich that mentioned God; at present these difficult words make v.[23] a tristich; and God, who must be the subj. of [23b. c], is not mentioned.] We may acquiesce in (3) or (4).

וְיַמְטֵר] unless יהי be kept as a real jussive, rd. either וְימטר or יַמְטֵר.

עלימו] if correct, *must* be here (notice בלחומו) an anom. sing. for עליו (which Me. Sgf. Bi. Di. Du. St. would in each case restore, and which, at least here and 27[23], might easily have become עלימו from the end of the following word); cf. 22[2] 27[23], Ps. 11[7]; G–K. 103*f*, n. The form, as a sg., is very much against analogy; but it has been supposed to be supported by a Phœn. sing. sf. in ם— (Stade, § 345*c*, who would read עָלֵים; Kö. ii. 44*b*, with references); the existence of this is, however, doubted by others (cf. Lidzb. p. 395*f*; Cooke, *NSI*, on 42[5]).

בלחומו] לחום, as Zeph. 1[17] †: if correct, = Arab. *laḥm*, *flesh*, pl. *luḥūm* (I.E. בבשרו; and 𝔊 Zeph. 1[17] τὰς σάρκας αὐτῶν ὡς βόλβιτα): so Hi. De. "into his flesh." Di. Bu. בְּלַחְמוֹ, and raineth *His bread* (or *food*) upon him, *i.e.* sends upon him a rain, not of manna (Ex. 16[4], Ps. 78[24]), but of destruction: the ב as 16[4. 10]. Or, as this use of ב is not very probable with ימטר, ב may be the *Beth essentiæ* (*Lex.* 88*b*), and raineth it (his anger) upon him *as* his bread (*or* food); so RVm. 𝔊 ὀδύνας; whence Me. Sgf. Klo. חֲבָלִים (usually in 𝔊 ὠδῖνες: see also on 21[23]). Schwally בַּלָּהָה (= ὀδύναι, 18[11] 27[20] 30[15]), Bi. בַּלָּהוֹת, Be. פֶּחָם, "coals," "obliterating Zophar's characteristic, and therefore certainly original, figure" (Bu.). Du. (omitting [a]), "perhaps the author wrote simply וימטר עָלָיו חֲמָתוֹ."

24. תחלפהו] חלף, to *pass quickly* (9[26]) *through* = to *strike through*, *pierce*; so Jg. 5[26] ומחצה וחלפה רַקָּתוֹ.

25. גֵּוָה] by these who retain 𝔐, גֵּוָה † is taken as a ‖ *fem.* form to גֵּו; but "his" is needed: read certainly גֵּוֹה, *his back* (𝔖 ܚܨܗ). The accents in ordinary editions connect יהלך with ממררתו (so EVV.); but this leaves עליו אמים a very short and abrupt clause: and some MSS read, no doubt correctly, ממררתו (Wickes, *Poet. Accents*, p. 37). Di. He draws it forth (שָׁלַף, as

Jg. 3^{22}), and it cometh out of the [rd. *his*] back, and the glittering point goeth out from his gall: terrors (*i.e.* death-terrors) are upon him; Hi. De. Bu. . . . and the glittering point from his gall; terrors come (Me. as G–K. 145*o*; Sgf. Be.; better, יְהַלְּכוּ) upon him,—but for this יבאו (Di.) would be the proper word, not יהלך or יהלכו; Du. וברק (so Sgf. Be.) וַיֵּצֵא שֶׁלַח מִגֵּוֹה ממררתו יְהַפְּכוּ עליו אֵמִים (for * cf. 𝔊 διεξέλθοι δὲ διὰ σώματος αὐτοῦ βέλος: שֶׁלַח, as Jl. 2^{8} al.; but Be.[K] שֶׁלֶף = Syr. ܫܠܦܐ, a *knife without a handle*, PS. 4197 (but only in lexx.; cf. ܫܠܦܘܬܐ, the *blade* of a knife, *ib.*): for יהפכו, cf. 1 S. 4^{19}, Dn. 10^{16}, c. 30^{15} הָהְפַּךְ עליו בַּלָּהוֹת; יֵהָפְכוּ for יהלך is idiomatic and probable). [Richter: שלח יוצא מנוה ובקרב מררתו יהלך, weapons—though he pull (one) out of the back, yet (another) pierces deep into his gall—making the thought and construction similar to v.^{24} (𝔐), and in this respect, perhaps, the emendation is on the right lines; but against מנוה and יהלך, see above.]

26. טמון] טמן is *to hide* (cf. מַטְמוֹן, 3^{21}); only here in the sense of *reserve for* (which is usually expressed by צפן).

תאכלהו] Very anomalous. Acc. to De. a shortened Po'el form for תְּאֹכְלֵהוּ (cf. תְּרָצְחוּ, Ps. 62^{4}; מְלָשְׁנִי, 101^{5} Qrê—מְלָוֹשְׁנִי, Kt. better); but the Po'el of אכל occurs nowhere else, the ֻ is anomalous, and in Ps. 62^{4} the pointing תְּרַצְּחוּ is to be preferred: rd. therefore simply תְּאכְלֵהוּ (Di., G–K. 68*f*, Bu. Du.).

לא נפח] suggesting, or hinting at, some other mode of kindling (viz. from heaven); see *Lex.* 518*b*, *bottom*; cf. 34^{20}, Dn. 2^{34}.

נֻפָּח] "Before לֹא נֻפָּח, אשר as an acc. must be supplied, as though *ignis, quem non sufflatum est*; cf. *e.g.* Gn. 35^{26}, Is. 14^{3}" (Hi.). Cf. 22^{9}; and see G–K. 121*a*, *b*. Du. לֹא נֻפָּחָה, *which hath not been blown*,—the normal construction.

יֵרַע] jussive Qal of רָעָה, *graze on*, fig. for *consume*; cf. Jer. 22^{22} כָּל־רֹעַיִךְ תִּרְעֶה רוּחַ. To avoid the masc. subj. after the fem. תאכלהו (though see G–K. 145*t*), Ol. Hfm. Di. Sgf. Bu. יֵרַע (apoc. impf. Nif.), *is grazed on*; but the pass. does not read naturally. Hi. יֵרַע (from רָעַע), *fares ill* (cf. Jer. 11^{16} ורעו דָּלִיּוֹתָיו); but this (Di.) is weak. Du. objects to the fig. to *graze on*,

and to שׂריד, in a neuter sense (see, however, v.[21]), and "in default of anything better" proposes יָעֵר שֹׁדֵד, *the waster* (15[21]) *stirs himself up* against his tent. Be.[K] יְדָעֵהוּ שָׁבִיב (18[5]).

27. מִתְקוֹמָמָה] *milra'*, the *Sinnorith* merely marking the open syllable before the *mêr'kha* (Wickes, *Poet. Acc.* 69; cf. Ps. 1[2] יוֹמָם וָלָיְלָה). The fem. מתקוֹמָמָה is anomalous (Stade, § 290): we should expect מתקוֹמֶמֶת; cf. מִשְׂכֶּלֶת, מִתְנַכֶּרֶת (חָסָיוּ בוֹ), Dt. 32[37], cited by De., is not parallel; for (1) the tone here is *milra'* not *mil'êl*, and (2) the ָ in חָסָיוּ is regular, G–K. 75*u*).

28. יִגֶל] on the juss. form, see on 18[12].

יבול] elsewhere (12 times) always of the *produce* of the earth (*e.g.* Lv. 26[4] ונתנה הארץ יבולה), or specifically of the produce of the vine (Hab. 3[17]) ואין יבול בגפנים; here, if correct, of the *acquired possessions* of his house.

נִגָּרוֹת] (as) things *dragged away* (from גָּרַר, Pr. 21[7], of fish in a net, Hab. 1[15]; in 𝔗 for סָחַב, Jer. 15[3] al.),—or (so most) *poured away* (from נָגַר, 2 S. 14[14] כַּמַּיִם הַנִּגָּרִים ארצה, Mic. 1[4] כְּמַיִם מֻגָּרִים בְּמוֹרָד),—in the day of his anger. נִגָּרוֹת is an accus. defining the state (G–K. 118*n*); EVV. "(His goods) shall flow away," etc., is a monstrous and impossible translation. For יִגֶל Ew. Me. read יָגֹל, *rolleth away* (like a stream, Am. 5[24]), as more congruous with the fig. in [b] ("poured away"). 𝔊 ἑλκύσαι τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ ἀπωλία εἰς τέλος, ἡμέρα ὀργῆς ἐπέλθοι αὐτῷ, whence Be. יָגֹל יְבַל בֵּיתוֹ וְנִגַּר אתו ביום אפו, The stream (Is. 30[25] 44[4] †) rolleth his house along, And washeth it away in the day of his anger [but נגר אתו for נגרו is very questionable; cf. 19[26] n. end]: Du. יִגַּר בְּלִי ביתו מנערת ביום אפו, Destruction carrieth away his house, The rebuke (Dt. 28[20]) in the day of his anger; but Is. 38[17] שַׁחַת בְּלִי, pit of *wearing away* (*i.e.* destruction—of Sheol) scarcely justifies the proposed use of בלי here. Bu. adheres to 𝔐, though allowing that the pl. נגרות (for נִגָּר pt., or נִגַּר pf., referring to ביתו) is strange.

אדם] [unnecessary, and rhythmically redundant].

29. נחלת אמרו] his heritage of appointment = his appointed heritage (G–K. 135*n*); cf. וְלֶחֶם אָמַר לוֹ, 1 K. 11[18]. Be. עָרִיץ (cf. 27[13b]); 𝔊 ὑπαρχόντων αὐτῷ = אונו (from און, v.[10]), whence Du. אונו, *his naughtiness* (from אָוֶן, 4[8] etc.).

CHAPTER XXI.

2. שִׁמְעוּ שָׁמוֹעַ מִלָּתִי] as 13^{17}.

תַנְחוּמֹתֵיכֶם] 𝕲𝕾𝕿 (𝖁 agite pœnitentiam), Du. תַנְחוּמַתְכֶם; but the Vss. would hardly have rendered by a plu., even if they had read it.

3. [שָׂאוּנִי] *bear with me*: an unusual nuance; the other examples grouped under *2e* in *Lex.* (p. 671*a*), such as Jer. 15^{15} 31^{19}, Ps. 55^{13} with acc. rei, are different.]

תַלְעִיג] 𝕲 Ol. Me. Sgf. Bi. Be. Du. תלעיגו; but the reference may be more particularly to Zophar (Bu., who compares the sg. in 16^3 between plurals in ^{1} and ^{4}). For ^{b} 𝕲 has *εἶτα οὐ καταγελάσατέ μου*, paraphrasing: in 𝕸 Job speaks defiantly, for he knows Zophar will not mock; 𝕲 states explicitly what is in Job's mind. Me. (after 𝕲) ואחר דברי לא תלעיגו, Sgf. ואז לא תלעיגו לי, Du. ואחר לא תלעיגו — all as violent as they are unnecessary.

4. הֶאָנֹכִי] prefixed for emph. (G–K. 143*a*; Dr. 197. 4; cf. Gn. 24^{27} אנכי בדרך נָחַנִי יהוה, 49^8): whatever may be the case with others, *my* complaint is not of man. So Du. *Ja ich, gilt Menschen meine Klage?* Be. הַאָמְנָם (Nu. 22^{37}, 1 K. 8^{27}, Ps. 58^2).

5. הָשַׁמּוּ] for the pathaḥ, see G–K. 67*v*; cf. הֵסַבּוּ, 1 S. $5^{9. 10}$. If correct, an "inwardly transitive" Hif. (G–K. 53*d*), "*shew* appalment," though elsewhere הֵשֵׁם is always trans., except Ezk. 3^{15} וָאֵשֵׁב שָׁם . . . מַשְׁמִים (where, however, שׁוֹמֵם, 2 S. 13^{20}, or מְשׁוֹמֵם, Ezr. $9^{3. 4}$, could easily be read). As Bu. observes, to have the Qal יִשֹּׁמּוּ, 17^8, the Nif. נָשַׁמּוּ, 18^{20}, and here the Hif., with the same force in one and the same book, is rather strange; hence he would point all as Nif. The pf., however, occurs (often) in *both* Qal and Nif.; the impf. is *always* pointed as Qal, so 17^8 had better remain as it is; but

the Nif. הִשַּׁמּוּ here would avoid the anomalous sense of הֵשַׁם, and is probable.

6. The same type of hypothetical sentence as 7^4, where see note.

ואחז בשרי] 'ב is subj.; cf. 18^{20} with n.

7. עתקו] *advance* in years, *grow old*: so Ps. 6^8†, and עַתִּיק, *old*, 1 Ch. 4^{22}†. Both עָתֵק, ܥܬܩ, and עַתִּיק (Dn. $7^{9.13.22}$), ܥܬܝܩ, are common in Aram. in the same senses.

גברו חיל] חיל is accus. = *as regards*, Engl. "in"; G–K. 117*z*; cf. Gn. 41^{40} רק הַכִּסֵּא אגדל ממך.

8. לפניהם עמם] An ineligant redundancy. לפניהם is almost tautologous with ᵇ לעיניהם; so עמם is to be preferred (Sgf. Be.ᵀ Bu.). לפניהם may be a variant to לעיניהם, which found its way into ᵃ (Be.). [The rhythm of 𝔐 is very questionable (17^1 n.); if לפניהם is omitted, the rhythm is probably 3 : 2 (17^{14} n.): perhaps עמם ו conceals a parallel to נכון; if so, the *rhythm* was normal.]

9. שלום] constr. as 5^{24}, Pr. 3^{17} (G–K. 141*c*). 𝔊 εὐθηνοῦσιν, 𝔙 securæ sunt, 𝔖 ܫܠܝܢ, whence Sgf. Du. שְׁלֵמוּ. But these renderings are not evidence that their authors *read* שלמו; they may be merely (like RVm. "*in* peace") accommodations to their native idioms.

מפחד] *away from* fear = *so that there is no* fear (Hi.: cf. Is. 7^8 etc.; *Lex.* 583*a*, *b*), or = *without* fear (*Lex.* 578*a*, b, towards the end; cf. on 11^5). So Pr. 1^{33} וְשַׁאֲנַן מִפַּחַד רָעָה.

. . . ולא] not . . . ואין: *Lex.* 519*a*, b, *b*; $18^{17.19}$ al.

10. עִבַּר] see *Lex.* 718*b*. In NH. עִבֵּר is to *become pregnant*, to *conceive*, and מְעוּבֶּרֶת is *made pregnant*; עִבּוּר is *conception*, and עוֹבָר the *embryo* (*NHWB* iii. 610*b*, 612*b*).

ולא יגעיל] געל is to *abhor*, *loathe* (Lv. 26^{11} al.); hence לא יגעיל either *showeth not aversion* (*sc.* to the cow), or *causeth not* (the cow) *to loathe*. Ra. Ki. Del. explain from the NH. sense of הגעיל: Ra. לא יוֹרָה בָהּ זרע פְּסוֹלֶת שֶׁיְּהֵא חוֹזֵר וְנִפְלָט (that it might return and escape) בלא חֲרִיּוֹ; Ki. ולא יפלים (allow to escape) הזרע וישליכנו; Del. (but understanding יגעיל in a *causative*

sense) "*neque efficit ut ejiciat* (semen)": cf. NH. הגעיל, to *rinse* a vessel from dirt or impurity with hot water (*ʿAbodah sarah*, 70*a*, מַגְעִילוֹ ברותחין, one *rinses it* (properly, "causes it to abhor and reject (its dirt)," *ausstossen machen*, Del.) with boiling water (cf. *NHWB* i. 350 f.). Whether הגעיל had acquired this specialized sense when the book of Job was written, we do not know: it is safer to acquiesce in one of the renderings given above. 𝕿 מבטין, *impraegnans* (Del.).

תפלט] lit. *maketh to escape*, *i.e.* bringeth forth. Cf. וְהִמְלִיט, Is. 34[15]; הִמְלִיטָה, 66[7].

11. עויליהם] see on 19[18].

12. ישאו] *sc.* קוֹל, as Is. 3[7] 42[2, 11].

כְּתֹף] so 𝕸, Baer (p. 46), Ginsburg; בְּתֹף, c. 30 MSS, 𝕲 (ἀναλαβόντες ψαλτήριον) 𝕾𝕿𝖁 (tenent tympanum). 'ב is *with* (= to the accompaniment of), cf. Ps. 49[5]: 'כ, will be *according to*, with no appreciable difference in meaning.

לקול] ל = *at*, or here (as we should say) *to*, as Hab. 3[16], Qoh. 12[4], Nu. 16[34] (*Lex.* 516*b*, j, end).

13. יבלו] בָּלָה is to *wear out* (intrans.), especially of garments (Dt. 8[4] al.); בִּלָּה is to *wear out* (trans.), as La. 3[4] בִּלָּה בשרי ועורי: hence here and Is. 65[22] (ומעשה ידיהם יְבַלּוּ) it has been supposed to mean to *wear out by use*, *use to the full*, *enjoy*. But it is unlikely that a verb meaning to *wear out* would come to be used in this good sense; and it is better (Du. Be.) in both places to read יְכַלּוּ, *they finish*, *bring to an end* (cf. Jb. 36[11] יְכַלּוּ ימיהם בטוב; Ps. 90[9]; Ex. 5[13] כַּלּוּ מעשיכם); so Qrê, 𝕲 (συνετέλεσαν) 𝕾𝕿𝖁 (ducunt).

ברגע] *in a moment*; *i.e.* they have a quick, painless death. 𝕲 ἐν ἀναπαύσει, 𝕿 וּבְמַרְגּוֹעַ: whence Hfm. Be. Buhl, Du. Bu. either point בְּרֹגַע, or take רֶגַע in the sense of *tranquillity* (cf. הִרְגִּיעַ, Jer. 31[2]; רִגְעֵי ארץ, Ps. 35[20]; מַרְגּוֹעַ, Jer. 6[16]; מַרְגֵּעָה, Is. 28[12]).

יֵחָתּוּ] rd. יֵחֲתוּ, *go down*, the pl. of יֵחַת, Pr. 17[10], from נָחַת, common in Aram., only poet. in Heb.; so Σ κατέρχονται, 𝕾𝕿 נחתין, 𝖁. descendunt. As pointed in 𝕸, it could just be derived artificially from נָחַת by G–K. 20*i*; but it can be naturally only the Nif. of חָתַת, with the unsuitable sense, "unto Sheol *are they affrighted*."

14. ויאמרו] *And yet* they say, etc.: the וְ introducing a *contrasted* idea (Dr. 74β; cf. Gn. 19[9] 32[31], 2 S. 3[8]). [𝕲 λέγει δέ: so ἀπ' ἐμοῦ and βούλομαι—sing. for pl. of 𝕸, "to reduce the number of the godless of which v.[14] speaks to a minimum" (Be.).]

15. 𝕲 om. (supplied in [B] from Θ),—no doubt on account of its blasphemous character.

16. מֶנִּי] in pause for מִנִּי: see on 16[6]. [The rhythm is apparently 3 : 4 (cf., perhaps, 4[12. 20]), which is very rare (see Gray, *Forms*, pp. 176, 181 f.): note that in 22[18], where [b] recurs, the rhythm is 4 : 4.]

17. כמה] *How often?* not an exclamation, but a question, and a sceptical one: how often does it really happen that this fate overtakes the ungodly?

חבלים] might mean (*a*) *cords* (to ensnare; so Del.), with reference to 18[10–12] (חַבְלוֹ, in v.[10]), but יְחַלֵּק, *distributes*, is not very suitable to "cords"; (*b*) *pains* (Ges. *Thes.*, Hi., EVV. *sorrows*); but the word in this sense is elsewhere used only of *birth*-pangs (Is. 13[8] 26[17] al.; 𝕲 here ὠδῖνες); (*c*) *portions* (lit. (measuring) lines, Mic. 2[5] al., used in a fig. sense, Ps. 16[6] (The *lines* have fallen to me in pleasant places), and often also in the derived sense of *measured portion*, or *lot* of land, Dt. 32[9] al., here, with reference to 20[29], in the sense of *lots in life*, Ges. *Addenda* to *Thes.* p. 87, Ew. Di. Bu.; but "portions" alone, without any qualification, is too vague and indefinite to be probable; and Ps. 16[6] (with נפלו לי and בנעימים) hardly justifies the use of חבלים absolutely of *lots in life*: as Du. says, it only suggests naturally portions of *land*. Lots in life would be rather חֲלָקִים, 20[29] 27[13] 31[2], Is. 17[14]. 𝕲 ὠδῖνες δὲ ἕξουσιν αὐτοὺς ἀπὸ ὀργῆς; whence Me. Sgf. חבלים יאחזום מֵאפו; but מֵ is very improbable (for the frequent confusion of ב and מ between LXX and MT., see *Samuel*[2], p. lxvii); Du. better, חבלים יְחֻזקם באפו, *Cords take hold of them in his anger* (but Du. takes אפו with the next stichos), as Bildad had maintained, 18[10].

19. אלוה] [if retained, Job is either citing a sentiment of the friends, and it is necessary in English to prefix, with EVV.

(Ye say); see on v.[16]: or the v., together with v.[20], is still dependent on the כמה of v.[17] and like that v. a sceptical question: so Be.[T]. But Be.[K] adopts Ley's suggestion to read אֵל for אלוה (so also Du., who regards 𝔊's ἐκλιποι as a free rendering of אֵל־יָצְמַן). The position of אלוה before the vb. has no apparent justification, and with אלוה the distich is rhythmically suspicious (4 : 3; see 17[14] n.): if אֵל is read, the rhythm is normal—3 : 3].

20. יראו] before the fem. עיניו (G–K. 145*p*).

כידו †] if correct, *craft*: cf. Arab. *kāda*, to *beguile* or *circumvent*; *kayd*, *an artful device* (Qor. 7[182] 20[68]; Lane, 2638*f*). Read פידו (12[5] 30[24] 31[29], Pr. 24[22] †), or אֵידו (v.[17]).

21. חֻצָּצוּ] Arab. *ḥaṣṣa* is to *cut* or *sever*, also to *become a portion* (*ḥaṣṣani*, became my portion), conj. iv. *aḥṣaṣtuhu*, *I gave him a portion* or *share*; *ḥiṣṣat*[un], a *portion* or *share* (Lane, 579*f*); Eth. *ḥaṣaṣa*, to *curtail*, *diminish*; Ass. *haṣâṣu*, to *cut in two*: in Heb. Pr. 30[27], the locusts have no king, וַיֵּצֵא חֹצֵץ כֻּלּוֹ, yet they go forth *divided* (*into companies*), "*divisi*, *i.e.* agmine partito," Ges. Hence (1) when the number of his months *hath been apportioned* (to him), so Ew. Schl. Di.[1]; or (2) *hath been cut off* (i.e. *finished*: cf. בָּצַע, to *cut off*, but also to *finish*, Is. 10[12], Zec. 4[9]); so Ges. Del. Di.[2] Bu. Du. But Ew. Grä. Be. Bu. all suggest as possible חָרְצוּ, *are cut off*, i.e. *are determined* (see 14[5]). The pl. by attraction to חדשיו (G–K. 146*a*); cf. 38[21].

22. רמים] "Ins alltägliche wird dieser Sinn abgeschwächt durch דָּמִים statt רָמִים nach LXX φόνους (Me. Grä.)" (Bu.).

23. בעצם תמו] עֶצֶם, lit. *bone*, then *body*, *substance*, *of* . . ., is the Hebrew idiom for expressing the idea of *reality*: so Ex. 24[10] (JE) כְּעֶצֶם השמים = like heavèn *itself*, and often in Ezk. (4 times) and P (14 times †), in היום הזה (or עד עצם) בעצם, to express *this very day*. Cf. Aram. גְּרַם, and ܓܪܡܗ (with sf.), lit. *bone*, used often in the same sense (so perh. once in Heb., 2 K. 9[13]). In Arab. عَيْن, *eye*, is used similarly (Del.; Lane, 2216*c*–2217*a*).

כֻּלּוֹ] *Lex.* 481*b* (bottom).

שלאנן] a *lapsus calami* for שאנן (12^{5}), due to a scribe's eye accidentally lighting upon the following ושליו (Ol. Di. etc.).

שָׁלֵיו] = שָׁלֵו, 16^{12} 20^{20}; cf. Jer. 49^{31} שְׁלֵיו (Kö. ii. p. 144; cf. G–K. p. 240*n*); the י merely secures the consonantal character of the ו (Kö. ii. p. 83).

24. עטיניו] In NH. עטן is to *put in*, of putting olives into a *vat* or press; in Arab. عطن is to put hides into a corrosive fluid to remove the hair; NH. מַעֲטָן is an olive-*vat*, in which olives are kept till they are ready for the press (*NHWB*, *s.v.*). עטין will thus have denoted some vessel: we may render here *pails*. 𝔊 ἔγκατα, 𝔙 viscera, 𝔗 ביזוי, his *breasts* (so Rabb., EVV.), 𝔖 ܓܒ̈ܘܗܝ his *sides* (flanks)—all guesses, to suit the ‖ עצמותיו. Be. Klo. עֲטָמָיו †, his *loins* (with חֵלֶב for חָלָב) = Syr. ܥܛܡܐ (= יָרֵךְ, Gn. 32^{32} and often; really the same word as Heb. עֶצֶם = عظم, *bone*, Dr. 178, p. 226): precarious, and unnecessary.

וישקה] cf. Pr. 3^{8} רפאות תהי לְשָׁרֶּךָ וְשִׁקּוּי לעצמותיך.

25. אכל ב׳] the ב׳ partitive, as Ex. 12^{43} לא יאכל בו, Ps. 141^{4} לָחם ב׳, Nu. 11^{1} etc.

26. יחד] notice the emphatic and idiomatic position of יחד at the beginning: as 19^{12} 24^{4} al. (*Lex.* 403, Ib).

27. עלי תחמסו] (wherewith) ye *deal violently* against me (G–K. 155*k*), cf. 𝔊 ἐπίκεισθέ μοι; Du. תַּחְפְּשׂוּ, (which) ye *search out* (Ps. 64^{7}) against me; Be.^{K} (cf. 𝔖 ܡܬܚܫܒܝܢ, 𝔗 תחשלון) תַּחְרְשׁוּ (which) ye *devise* (Pr. 3^{29} אל תַּחֲרֹשׁ על רֵעֲךָ רעה, 6^{14} 14^{22}) against me. [Jacob (*ZATW*, 1912, p. 287) תהמסו; cf. ܗܡܣܣ, *to meditate.*]

28. אהל משכנות רשעים] 1 MS$^{K\ 111}$, 𝔙 om. אהל; so Be. Du. Bu. Cf., however, for a syn. in the gen., 37^{6} וְשֶׁם מִטְרוֹת עֻזּוֹ; Ps. 26^{8}, Is. 25^{12} מבצר משגב חומותיך, 13^{19}: משכ׳ is a poet. amplificative pl., G–K. 124*b*; Kö. 260*f*. [Thus there is is no stylistic objection to 𝔐, and, since 𝔊(Θ)𝔖𝔗 agree with 𝔐, the textual evidence for the omission of אהל is of very little weight. If on rhythmical grounds it is necessary to omit a word in ^{b}, it would be better to omit איה there, איה in ^{a} governing both lines (as does הֲ in 22^{4}), and being united with בית under a single

stress (cf. probably Jer. 2^{6}); in this case, or, if we stress איה, and with Ehrlich omit כי תאמרו, the rhythm is normal—3 : 3. In 𝔐 it is 4 : 4 (איה being stressed, as, *e.g.*, Ps. 42^{4}); but both lines lack the cæsura within the line characteristic of this rhythm (Gray, *Forms*, 160, 164, 169).]

29. שְׁאֶלְתֶּם] G-K. 44*d*, 64*f*.

תְנַכֵּרוּ] נכר has in Heb. opposite meanings. הִכִּיר (often) is to *recognise*, *regard*; but the Pi. נִכֵּר is to *treat as foreign* (denom. from נָכְרִי, Bu.), *misunderstand* in 1 S. 23^{7} (but rd. here סִגַּר or מָכַר), Dt. 32^{27}, Jer. 19^{4} †, but Jb. 34^{19} † it is to *regard*: the Nif. in La. 4^{8} † is to *be recognised*, but in Ps. 26^{24} † to *make oneself foreign*, *disguise oneself*, *dissemble*; the Hithp. in Pr. 20^{11} † is to *let oneself be recognised*, but in Gn. 42^{7}, 1 K. $14^{5.6}$ to *act as a foreigner*, to *disguise oneself*. In Arab. *nakura* is to *be ignorant of*, Qor. 11^{73}; to *deny*, *repudiate*, Qor. 16^{85}; conj. ii. to *make unknown*, *disguise*, Qor. 27^{41}, iv. to *be ignorant of*: in Syr. ܐܶܬܢܰܟܰܪ is to *recognise*, ܢܟܰܪ (twice), to *repudiate* (but PS. 2378 would read ܢܰܟܰܪ, *treat as alien*, *repudiate*, etc.). Nöld. (*Beiträge*, ii. 96) sees in these usages different applications of the idea of *foreign* (cf. נֵכָר, נָכְרִי), to *look closely at what is strange*, and hence to *recognise*, but also to *avoid* a thing as something unknown (*munkar*^{un}): so Ges. in *Lex. man.* (see *Thes.* 887*b*, *top*). The most natural sense here is *recognise*, *regard* (as 34^{19}), carrying on the question in ^{a} (Ew. Bu. al.); Del. Di.[2], however, "And their tokens ye will not misunderstand?" ("*werdet ihr* doch nicht verkennen?").

30. ליום וג׳] That *in view of* (or, as we should say, *against*) the day of calamity the evil man *is withheld*: חשך ל׳, to withhold, keep back, *in view of*—in 38^{23} in order to utilize, here in order to *spare* (cf. sq. מן, 33^{18}, Ps. 78^{50}, abs. 2 K. 5^{20}: cf. ליום (=*for*, *against*, rather than *in*) in Ps. 81^{4}, Pr. 7^{20}, Is. 10^{3} = Hos. 9^{5}. EVV. with Rabb. "is reserved *to*" (cf. Pr. 16^{4}); but the context shows that here this sense is impossible: it would simply stultify Job's argument. RVm. rightly, "is spared in." ביום (twice) would, however, undoubtedly be clearer; and it is possible (Di.) either that words have fallen out which would make v.[30] (= "reserved *for*") express the opinion of

Job's opponents, or that an original ביום (so Di. Sgf. Be. Bu.) has been altered (twice) into ליום on dogmatic grounds.

עברות] the pl. as 40[11]. 𝔊(Θ) עברתו, perhaps rightly.

יובלו] הוביל is to lead *along*, especially in a procession (v.[32] 10[19]), but not, at least not elsewhere, (𝔊) to lead *away*: יֻצָּל(וּ) (Me. Di. Gr. Be. Bu.) is a probable emendation. Me. Di. Be. Bu. יֻצָּל (יוּבָל); but where a *class* of persons is referred to, as here in רָע, Hebrew poets often alternate between sg. and pl., and 𝔊 already agrees with 𝔐 (ἀπαχθήσονται Τίς).

31. על פניו] as 6[28] 1[11]. [b] Dr. 154; cf. 7[20] 19[4] 23[10], Am. 3[8].

32. קברות] as 17[1] [n.].

גדיש] 'ג is a *sheaf* (5[26], Ex. 22[5], Jg. 15[5]): read גָּדִשׁ = Arab. *jadath*, a *sepulchre* (Qor. 54[7]).

ישקוד] שקד is to *be wakeful* (Ps. 127[1]), with the collateral idea of *watching* (Jer. 1[12] 5[6] al.). The tomb is supposed to be a fine one: the effigy of the deceased stands above it; and the poet imagines him to be watching over it himself. But many, as Häv. Ol. Hi. Reuss, Me. Bu., who render "one watcheth," and Me. Du. St., who read ישקדו, "men watch," suppose the meaning to be that so far from being forgotten, as Bildad had declared (18[17]), the memory of the evil man is honoured, and care is taken (cf. שקד in Jer. 1[12]) to guard his tomb against desecration. 𝔊(Θ) καὶ αὐτὸς ἐπὶ σωρῶν (over the *sheaves* produced by his estate) ἠγρύπνησεν; cf. Ra. ועל גדיש ישקוד כשהוא נקבר אצל הגדישים.

33. רגבי] 38[38] †. [Cf. ἐργάβ, ἀργάβ, in 1 S. 20[19. 41] 𝔊.]

נחל] [commonly *torrent-valley*, *wady*; but it is very far from obvious why the rich man's grave should be in a *wady*. Therefore Jacob has suggested that here] נחל = *dust* (as in Chr. Pal.); *ZDMG* lv. 141 = *ZAW* xxii. (1902) 102. [Jacob observes that in the Chr. Palestinian Aramaic dictionaries נחל commonly renders the Greek σποδός: so, *e.g.*, in Heb. 9[13] σποδὸς δαμάλεως is rendered נחלא דעגלתא; and in Is. 61[3] ἀντὶ σποδοῦ ἄλειμμα εὐφροσύνης, חלוף נחלא מישח דביסם; so also in Gn. 18[27], Jon. 3[6], σποδός; and in Ex. 9[10] αἰθάλη are rendered by נחל: see the texts in *A Palestinian Syriac Dictionary containing Lessons from the Pentateuch*, etc., ed. A. S. Lewis.]

ימשוך] apparently intrans. (cf. Germ. *ziehen*), to *move along in a line*, as (in a *military* sense) Jg. 4^{6} (cf. v.[7], trans.), 5^{14} (perhaps), 20^{37} (Ex. 12^{21} is dub.).

34. הבל] adv. acc. = *idly*, *in vain*, as 9^{29}.

ותשובותיכם] an extreme case of the *cas. pendens*, without the usual resumption by a pron. (Dr. 197): cf. 1 S. 20^{23}, 1 K. 6^{12}, 2 K. 22^{18b-19}, Jer. 44^{16}, Dn. 1^{20}, Is. 66^{18}, Hos. 8^{13} 𝔐, Ezk. 1^{18} 𝔐, 10^{22} (Dr. 197, *Obs.* 2; G–K. 143*a*, *β*; Kön. iii. 341*f*, *i*): and your answers—there remaineth (*sc.* of them) (but) faithlessness! = and your answers remain (but) faithlessness!

CHAPTER XXII.

2. [יסכן] cf. on 15^{8}.

[כִּי] (Nay:) *for*; see 5^{2}; *Lex.* 472*a*.

[עלימו] if correct, must be another case of the anom. sing. for עָלָיו; see on 20^{23}.

3. [תַּתֵּם] G–K. 67*g*. Strictly an Aramaizing form, though found in early Heb. (וַיַּסֵּב, Ex. 13^{18}), and often, no doubt, due only to the punctuators.

6. [אַחֶיךָ] so 𝔅 Gi. and most MSS, edd., 𝔊𝔖𝔙; Baer (p. 46) with many MSS, 𝔗 and Kimchi אָחִיךָ. The sense in either case is the same, the sg. being obviously intended in a general sense.

7. [מים] emphasized both by position and by the connection of לא with it instead of the vb.; cf. *Lex.* 518*b*, bot.]

8a. Dr. 197. 3; cf. Jg. 17^{5} והאיש מיכה לו בית אלהים, Pr. 24^{8}.

[נשוא פנים] נשא פני פ׳ is to *lift up the face* of a suppliant (opp. השיב פני פ׳, 1 K. 2^{16}) = *receive favourably*, Gn. 32^{21} etc.; so נשוא פנים, *lifted up in regard to face* (like נשוי פשע, etc.) means *one viewed favourably, held in repute*; so 2 K. 5^{1} (of Naʿaman), Is. 3^{3} 9^{14} †.

9. [יְדֻכָּא] ז׳ is an implicit *accus.*: cf. Gn. 4^{18}; and see G–K. 121*b*. 𝔊𝔖𝔗𝔙 תְּדַכֵּא (so Me. Sgf. Be.^{K} St.), but no doubt merely assimilating to ^{a}. If תדכא had originally stood here, why should it have been changed to the less obvious construction יְדֻכָּא? [A *deliberate* change is certainly improbable; yet in this pointed attack on what Job has done, the 2nd pers. alone seems natural. The vaguer passive is less probable even than the oblique references in v.^{8}—even if that v. be original and not a gloss.]

[10. Note the numerous bh, pi, and ph sounds, and the further assonance—*paḥad, paḥim.*]

11. "Or seest thou not the darkness, and the abundance of waters that covereth thee?" yields a poor sense. Rd. with 𝔊 (τὸ φῶς σοι σκότος ἀπέβη) Me. Bi. Du. [and to the improvement of the rhythm and parallelism] אוֹרְךָ חָשַׁךְ (Wr. Perl. Gr. Du. Be.[K] אור חָשַׁךְ) "*Thy light is darkened* (the fate of the wicked in 18[6]) that thou seest not, and abundance of waters doth cover thee."

ושפעת מים תכסך] so, *verbatim*, 38[34b], but of literal waters descending in a storm, cf. Is. 60[6] שִׁפְעַת גמלים תְּכַסֵּךְ.

12. גָּבַהּ ש׳] the pred. a subst., acc. to Dr. 189. 2, G-K. 141*c*; cf. 8[9], Ps. 92[9] ואתה מָרוֹם, lit. Thou art *loftiness*. [𝔖 (through dittography) הִגְבִּהַּ, which Be.[K] thinks possibly right.]

וראה ר׳] the "head" or "top" of the stars is a strange expression, and (Bu.) has sense only if we read יִרְאֶה (𝔊,—but connecting with [a]; Be.[K] alt.), or וּרְאֵה (Mich. Sgf. Be.), or וְרֹאֶה (Gr. Königsb.), or וְרָאָה (Be.[K] alt.), "And he (God) looketh (*i.e.* looketh down) upon the top of the stars,"—an idea not clearly expressed or very probable in itself. More probably, as Bu. suggests, ראש is an incorrect dittogr. of רְאֵה, "And see the stars, how lofty they are!" [The rhythm thus becomes normal—3 : 3.]

רָמּוּ] G-K. 20*i*. For [12b–16] 𝔊 has only τοὺς δὲ ὕβρει φερομένους ἐταπείνωσεν (= [15b–16a] ?).

13. וְאָמַרְתָּ] see on 15[32]; and cf. Pr. 5[12] וְאָמַרְתָּ. The metheg shows that אָ is the 2nd syll. before the tone: the וְ is consequently, as classical Heb. requires, the וְ *consec.*, giving the verb a frequentative force, *art in the habit of saying* (G-K. 112*m*).

הַבְּעַד] G-K. 100*l*.

14. חוּג] חוג is properly a *circle* (see on 26[10]); but it must denote here the round dome, or *vault*, of heaven, above the clouds: cf. Is. 40[22] היושב על חוג הארץ וישביה כחגבים, where (as היושב על shows) חוג הארץ must also be the *vault* of heaven (apparently) resting upon the earth, and (cf. וישביה כחגבים) at a considerable distance above it.

15. עולם] Chajes (see Ges.–Buhl [15]) עַוָּלִים, the *unrighteous*.

16. קמטו] 16[8].

ולא עת] so Mass. (Baer, p. 45); a circ. cl., as more usually with לא alone (34^{24}; *Lex.* 519*b*, e) or וְאֵין (5^9). 20 MSS have the easier בְּלֹא (15^{32}, Lv. 15^{25}, Qoh. 7^{17}).

נהר] acc. of product (G–K. 121*d*); cf. Is. 24^{12} (where the *order* is the same as here), Mic. 3^{12}.

17. למו] the direct narrative (ᵃ) changing into the oblique (Ps. 64^{6b}, after מי), as 19^{28} 𝕸. But 𝔊𝔖 לָנוּ, probably rightly.

18. Cf. 21^{16} n.

19. יראו . . . וְישמחו] cf. Ps. 107^{42} 69^{33}, 1 S. 19^5. 𝔊 *ἰδόντες δίκαιοι ἐγέλασαν, ἄμεμπτος δὲ ἐμυκτήρισεν*, whence Du. Be.[K] רָאוּ . . . וַיִּשְׂמָחוּ (but not לָעֲנוּ), on the ground that the downfall of the ancient מתי און would only be witnessed and triumphed over by their contemporaries. The past tense is certainly here more forcible.

20. קִימָנוּ] A strange and improbable collective word for *opponents* ("Aufstand = Insurgenten"; Kö. ii. 60): for the anom. ־ָם, cf. Ru. 3^2, and (always) כֻּלָּנוּ (G–K. 91*f*, cf. 61*c*, end). Ol. al. קָמֵנוּ, or, in view of the pl. יִתְרָם in ᵇ, קָמֵינוּ (Ps. 18^{40}, Dt. 33^{11}), with נכחדו for נכחד. But 𝔊(Θ) (*εἰ μὴ ἠφανίσθη*) *ἡ ὑπόστασις αὐτῶν* = יְקָמָם (Gn. $7^{4.23}$, Dt. 11^6 †; 𝔊 in Dt. *ὑπόστασις*), *their living substance*: so Me. Wr. Gr. Bu. St.; probably rightly.

21. ושלם] and *be at peace* (*sc.* with Him); cf. Ps. 7^5 שׁוֹלְמִי, my *peaceful one* (my friend). שָׁלֵם elsewhere is to *be complete*, 1 K. 7^{51} al.; to *be whole, uninjured, prosperous*, Jb. 9^4 †: the thought "And be prosperous" (the 2nd imper. expressing the *consequence* of the first, as often, G–K. 110*f*) would, however, unduly anticipate ᵇ and ²⁶ᶠᶠ·, and be out of place. The Hif. is more distinctly to *make peace* (Dt. 20^{10} al.), and perhaps וְהַשְׁלֵם should be read (Bu.).

בהם] = *in them* = by that course of action, as Ezk. 33^{18}; עליהם, Ezk. 18^{26} 33^{19}; G–K. 135*p* (in Is. 30^6 $38^{16a.b}$ 64^4 the text is most uncertain: Zeph. 2^7 rd. עַל הַיָּם).

תבואתך] a grammatical *monstrum*; see G–K. 48*d*. Rd. either תְּבוּאָתְךָ, *thy increase* (𝔊 *ὁ καρπός σου*, 𝔖𝔗, and most

moderns) or (Bu. St.) תְּבוֹאֶךָּ, will *come to* (or *upon*) *thee* (בוא, as Dt. 33^{16}; the sf. as often, though elsewhere usually in a hostile sense, 15^{21} 20^{22}, Pr. 10^{24} 11^{27}, Ps. 36^{12} al.; see, however, Ps. $119^{41.77}$). תבואה, literally *in-come*, used specifically (Ex. 23^{10} al.) of crops *brought in* from the field, is used often, especially in the Wisdom-literature, in the fig. sense of *gain*, *profit*, *advantage* (31^{12}, Pr. 3^{14b} 8^{19b} 10^{16} 16^{8} 18^{20}).

23. תבנה] anticipates [25] unduly, and also makes it difficult to carry on the force of אם to [b]. 𝔊 *καὶ ταπεινώσῃς σεαυτόν*, whence Ew. Di. תְּעַנֶּה (Ex. 10^{3}) = *humbling thyself* (constr. as 11^{18b}, see note: Dr. 163); Bi. וְתְעַנֶּה (Ps. 116^{10}); Be. Du. St. וְתֵעָנֶה; Me. Sgf. Gr. וְתִכָּנַע (1 K. 21^{29}, 2 K. 22^{19}; abs. Lv. 26^{41}, 2 Ch. $12^{6.7}$): Be.[K] Bu. either of the two last. תְּעַנֶּה is the neatest of these suggestions; but the repetition of אם before תרחיק would be also an improvement.

24. ושית] 𝔊 *θήσῃ* (without *καί*), whence Me. Gr. תָּשִׁית; but וְשִׁתָּה (Bi. Hfm. Bu.) carries on the sentence most smoothly. 𝔙 *dabit* (= יָשִׁית), but entirely altering the sense, Dabit pro terra silicem, et pro silice torrentes aureos.

בצר] v.[25] †. The exact meaning is uncertain; but probably from √ בצר, to *cut off*, *a fragment* or *nugget* of gold: sing. coll. *ore*, pl. (v.[25]) *nuggets*. Ges. *Thes*. compares Arab. *tibr*, *dust*, *nuggets*, or *crumbled particles* of gold, before it is wrought (Lane, 293), from √ *tabara*, ii. to *break in pieces*. 𝔊(Θ) *πέτρα* confuses with צור.

ובצור נחלים] and among the rocks (not *stones*, EVV.) of the wadys, though צוּרֵי (1 S. 24^{3}) would be better. Some 65 MSS, Θ𝔖𝔗 וּבְצוּר; but the ∥ על עפר suggests strongly a *place*. "ובצור might well be a faulty repetition of בֶּצֶר: from what remains in [b] וּבְחוֹל יַמִּים אופיר (cf. 6^{3}) might be easily restored" (Bu.[1.2]).

אופיר] short for כֶּתֶם א׳ (28^{16}, Is. 13^{12}, Ps. 45^{10} †); once, later, זְהַב א׳ (1 Ch. 29^{4} †).

25. בצריך] In pl. with an intensive force. 𝔊 *σου . . . βοηθὸς ἀπὸ ἐχθρῶν*, prob. = בְּצוּרֶךָ; *β*. a paraphrase of צור, as Ps. $17(18)^{2}$ $18(19)^{14}$ $77(78)^{35}$ $93(94)^{22}$. 𝔖 ܥܕܪܝܟ, probably the same; cf. 𝔖 Ps. 19^{14} 78^{35}. 𝔙 contra hostes tuos = בְּצָרֶיךָ.

[תועפות] Nu. $23^{22} = 24^{8}$ כְּתוֹעֲפֹת רְאֵם לוֹ, Ps. 95^{4} ותועפות הרים † לו. An uncertain and perplexing word. The Rabb. guessed *strength* (חוֹזֶק, חוֹסֶן); and so AV. Nu. Ps. and AVm. here ("silver of strength"): but the rendering has no philological support. Moderns generally derive by metathesis from Ar. √ *yapha'a*, to *ascend a hill; yapha', yapha'* (Gn. 49^{26}, Ex. 17^{9} al. Saad.), a *hill; yāphi', tall*, getting thus the meaning *eminence, height*. This would suit Nu. (RV. *horns*) and Ps. 95 (RV. *heights*), but badly here; for *lofty piles* (Di.), or *long bars* (Hi.; Di. alt.), is not a probable application of the idea of *lofty*; and we should, moreover, expect ותועפות כסף. Del. "Silber *höchsten Glanzes*," from *יפע in its Heb. sense of *shine*; cf. Hif. הוֹפִיעַ, and יִפְעָה, *eminentia, splendor*, Ezk. 28^{17} †: of this, RV. "*precious* silver" is no doubt a paraphrase. But a sense suiting also Nu. Ps. is needed. Wr. עוֹפֶרֶת, "and silver shall be *lead* to thee"; but this reverts rather awkwardly to the thought of [24]. A ∥ to שַׁדַּי is desiderated; hence Bu. St. תּוֹרָתוֹ (cf.[22]); Du. מוֹטָפוֹת, *headbands* or *frontlets* (Ex. 13^{16}, Dt. 6^{8} 11^{18} †), intended as a fig. designation of the same idea. 𝔊 ἀργύριον πεπυρωμένον (?, Tg. צְפַף, Del.: *v.* Levy).

27. [The rhythm (3 : 2) is unusual but hardly impossible (17^{14} n.), but 𝔊 in [b] (δώσει δέ σοι ἀποδοῦναι τὰς εὐχάς) may have read ויתן at the beginning of the line: this (cf. Ley in Be.[T]) is scarcely the original; but possibly וְיִתֵּר (∥ to תעתיר אליו) may have stood before ונדריך תשלם (∥ to וישמעך): then cf. Ps. $61^{6a.\ 9b}$.]

28. [ותגזר] גזר, usu. in Heb. to *cut, divide* (*e.g.* 1 K. 3^{25}); in Aram. (*e.g.* גְּזַר תַּעֲנִי, to *decree* a fast, Jl. 1^{14} 𝔗, ܓܙܪܘ ܨܘܡܐ 1 K. 21^{9} 𝔖), and NH. to *de-termine, re-cite, decree*. So in OT. only Est. 2^{1} and B. Aram. Dn. 2^{27} 5^{11} † *determiners* (of fate); גְּזֵרָה, a *decree*, Dn. $4^{14.\ 21}$ †. The וּ, as 3^{4}.

[אֹמֶר] Ps. $19^{3.\ 4}$ 68^{12} 77^{9}, Hab. 3^{9}†.

[וְיָקָם לך] both תגזר and יָקֹם are *jussives*: Dr. 152, iii., G–K. 159*d*; cf. Pr. 20^{25}, Ps. 104^{20} תָּשֶׁת־חשך וִיהִי לילה.

[נגה] The pf. as 5^{20}.

29. גֵּוָה stands here, as Jer. 13^{17}, Dn. 4^{34} Aram. (cf. 𝔗 גֵּיוְה), for גַּאֲוָה (G–K. 23*f*), which ought doubtless to be read: for שח

עינים, cf. Is. 2^{17} ושח גבהות האדם: the opp. גְּבַהּ עינים, Ps. 101^{5} (cf. 18^{28}), and Is. 5^{15} ועיני גבהים תשפלנה. 𝔐, now, has been taken in two ways: (1) "when men have abased (thee), and thou sayest (complainest), 'Pride!' then (Dr. 124) he will save him that is lowly," *i.e.* when proud men assail thee he will defend thee, provided thou hast shown becoming penitence and humility (Röd. Ges. *Thes.* 1466, Hi.: abased, as Pr. 25^{7}); (2) "If they (thy ways, v.[28]) are depressed (cf. Jer. 13^{18}), then (cf. Dr. § 153) thou sayest (= wilt say; but?) 'Up!' and he saveth him that is lowly," *i.e.* when misfortune overtakes thee, thy confidence in God gives thee courage to overcome it, and He will again give prosperity to the lowly (Ew. Del. Di.). But it must be obvious how strained each of these renderings is, and to what various objections each is open: the omission of an object to השפילו in (1), the unheard of sense of גוה in (2), and the disconnection caused by the awkward change from the 2nd to the 3rd pers. in both. There is a strong presumption that [a] is ‖ to [b]; hence Bu. כי השפיל אֱלוֹהַּ גאוה, "For *God* abaseth pride" (Is. 13^{11b}, Ps. 18^{28}, where תושיע is also opp. to תשפיל); Be. כי השפיל (ישפיל) את רָם וגוה (וְגֵאָה), "For *he* abaseth *the lofty and the proud*" (את, as Is. 41^{7} 50^{4}; G–K. 117*d*: גֵּאָה (so Be.[K]), as Is. 2^{12}); Du. כי השפיל אֹמֶר גַּאֲוָה, *he* abaseth *the word of pride*. 𝔊 already had ותאמר; but any one of these emendations yields the required sense. Du.'s deviates least from 𝔐: but השפיל אֹמֶר is doubtful; and Bu.'s is in form preferable to Be.'s.

30. אי נקי] if correct, the *non-innocent* = the *guilty*: אִי, as in Eth. (the common neg.) and Rabbinic; otherwise in OT. only presupposed in the explanation of אִי־כָבוֹד, 1 S. 4^{21}. אי and the periphrasis are alike improbable. [b] shows that Job himself cannot be referred to, and we should expect something like למענך, *for thy sake*, in [a]. 𝔊(Θ) for [a] has ῥύσεται ἀθῷον, 𝔙 salvabitur innocens. Me. Be.[K] אֵל (Ley, אֱלוֹהַּ) for אי (which, however, will not suit the emendation אֱלוֹהַּ in [29a]), with תִּמָּלֵט (Θ) in [b]. איש (Reiske, Dathe), with [b] תִּמָּלֵט, would give a good sense. Du. יְמַלֵּא תַּאֲוַת נָקִי (with כַּפָּיו, as 𝔖𝔙, in [b]) is clever and in itself suitable, but deviates a good deal from 𝔐.

CHAPTER XXIII.

2. גם־היום מרי שׂחי] 𝔊 καὶ δὴ οἶδα ὅτι ἐκ χειρός μου ἡ ἔλεγξίς ἐστιν, whence Ew. מִיָּדוֹ for מְרִי, Me. גם ידעתי מידו שׂחי (= is occasioned by Him); Be.[K] מִשַּׁדַּי (?) for מְרִי. [It is questionable whether Me. is right in concluding that 𝔊 read גם־ידעתי for גם־היום: it is quite as probable that 𝔊 read גם־היום ידעתי and that in this text, which would be clearly inferior to 𝔐, ידעתי was a mere dittograph from ידעתי in the following v. The particle גם is in Job most commonly translated by καί simply: so 1^6 2^1 13^{16} $16^{4.19}$ (καὶ νῦν = גם עתה) 18^5 30^8; occasionally by καί and another particle: so once by καὶ . . . μέν (12^3), once by καί . . . ἄρα (31^{28}), by καί γε in 30^2, and double καί γε . . . καί γε (= גם . . . גם) in 15^{10}. *Possibly*, therefore, καὶ δή may have been here another unusual equivalent for גם: but the only other occurrence of καὶ δή in Job renders כי עתה (6^3); as δή there renders the temporal עתה, so here it may render the temporal היום; and as καί there renders the כי, so here the גם.]

[גם־היום] *to-day also* is the most obvious rendering; *even to-day* (RV.) is equally legitimate (see BDB, *s.v.* גם, 2); but it is not easy to explain this emphasis on *to-day*, except on the assumption, clearly demanded by the alternative rendering, that the debate has already occupied more than one day. If this assumption is not to be allowed, it is necessary to emend, and no emendation can safely claim the support of 𝔊 (see preceding n.). If the point is: in spite of all that has been said in this debate, the debate being conceived as confined to a single day, גם עוד *still* (with emphasis) would be suitable; but this, like אמנם (Be., who compares 9^2 12^2) or גם חנה (Sgf.), would not have been easily corrupted into 𝔐 or 𝔊.]

מרי (Dt. 31^{27}; בית מרי, Ezk. $2^{5.6}$ al.), *defiance* (G–K. 141*c*), viz. against the acknowledgment of God's justice, and exhorta-

tions to submit to Him: cf. (Bu.) the utterances which accompany his "complaint," 7^{11-20} 9^{27-31} 10^{1-17} $21^{4ff.}$. 𝔖𝔗𝔙 מַר, *bitter* (cf. 7^{11c} 10^{1c}), in view of [b] probably rightly. The point here is not Job's defiance, but the continued severity of his sufferings.

ידי כבדה על אנחתי] 𝔊𝔖 Ew. Me. De. Di. Du. Be. al. (but not Bu.) יָדוֹ: *His* hand (13^{21} 19^{21}) is heavy (Ps. 32^4, 1 S. $5^{6.11}$) upon my groaning (3^{24}, Ps. 6^7 al.)—instead of desisting because of my groaning, His oppressing hand only aggravates it. Bu. (יָדִי) "and yet my hand is [still] heavy (still presses) upon my groaning," *i.e.*, as, after cc. 19, 21 he can claim, he strives to suppress such outbursts of feeling as those in cc. 6–7, 9–10, 12–14. AV. *my stroke* for ידי expresses the Rabbinic interpretation 𝔗 מַחְתִּי, Ra. *IE.* מַכָּתִי; *IE.* compares Ps. 77^3 (where AV. has similarly *my sore* for ידי).

3. ידעתי] The *pf.* after מי יתן (*Lex.* 678*f*) occurs only here, and seems hardly consistent with the meaning of מי יתן: Dt. 5^{26} מי יתן וְהיה is not parallel; the pf. with וְ cons. is syntactically very different from the pf. alone, and in many connections interchangeable with the bare impf. (which often follows מי יתן). Should דַּעְתִּי be read (the inf., as Ex. 16^3 al.; cf. on 11^5)? [If ידעתי were omitted with MS [Ken. 253] 𝔖 Be.[K] the constr. would be as in 19^{23} †.]

ואמצאהו] subordinated to (י)דעתי: cf. 6^9, Est. 8^6, Ca. 2^8; and (without וְ) Jb. 19^3 32^{22} (G–K. 120*c*).

תכונתו] apparently a *prepared* or *established place* = a *tribunal*; cf. 29^7 בָּרְחוֹב אָכִין מוֹשָׁבִי; הֵכִין כסאו, Ps. 103^{19}; כּוֹנֵן כסאו, Ps. 9^8.

6. הברב . . . לא אך] *In the greatness* . . . (*will he*) . . .? *Nay, but* . . .; Bu. הֵן ברב . . . לֻא, Behold in the greatness . . . he would . . . If only . . .

ישם בי] *sc.* לִבּוֹ (see on 4^{20}), which Du. metri causa [but unnecessarily even for this reason] would insert before בי. Gr. ישמע בי; but שמע sq. בְּ pers. is not found except once, Ps. 92^{12}, where (like ראה ב) it means *to hear exultingly of* their fate.

7. שָׁם] [4 MSS, Be. שָׂם. 𝔙 *proponat* would point to ישם rather than (Be.[K]) שָׂם. 𝔊 γάρ].

נוכח] ptc. properly = *in the state of one in mutual argument* (cf. נִשְׁפַּט; נָדוֹן, 2 S. 19^{10}): the Nif. (in a reciprocal sense, even with a sing. subj., like נִשְׁפַּט: G–K. 51*d*, and see Dr. on 1 S. 12^{7}).

עמו] [𝕿 עמי, 𝖁 contra me].

ואפלטה] the Pi. is elsewhere trans.: rd. וְאֶפָּלְטָה (Qal, as Ezk. 7^{16}). [𝕲 ἐξαγάροι, 𝖁 perveniat.]

מִשֹּׁפְטִי] 8 MSS, 𝕲𝖁 (but both altering besides both the reading and meaning of the v.), 𝕾 מִשְׁפָּטִי, whence Mich. Hi. Du. Be.[K], though upon insufficient grounds, "And I should rescue (Pi.) for ever *my right*."

8. אהלך] more vivid and suggestive than the ordinary אֵלֵךְ.

ואיננו] Or [Kt.] 𝕲 ואינני, presumably on dogmatic grounds.

אבין לו] cf. 9^{11}.

9. בעשתו] rd. with 𝕾 Me. Bu. Klo. Du. St. Be. בִּקַּשְׁתִּיו.

ולא אָחַז] cf. [11] ולא־אָם [cf. out of pause, תַּחַז, Mic. 4^{11}]. On the anomalous jussive form, see G–K. 109*k*; Dr. §§ 171, 175.

יעטף] not *covereth himself* (as Ps. 65^{14} 73^{6} †), but (Ew. Hi. Di. Del. etc.) *turneth back* (as Syr. ܥܛܦ, to *turn*, *turn back*, PS. 2860; Arab. *ʿaṭafa*), though אֶעְטֹף, "*I* turn back" (𝕾 ܘܐܬܥܛܦ, 𝖁 si vertam me; Du. Be.[K] Bu. St.) is better.

אראה] the sf. is often omitted with verbs like ראה, שמע, etc. [It is rhythmically improbable (unless, which is unlikely, the rhythm intended was 4 : 4) that it was pronounced אֶרְאֵהוּ (Be.[K]): we might rather expect אֵרָא like אֹחַז.]

10. דרך עמדי] the way (that is) with me—which I habitually take, my accustomed path (Ew. Di. Du.). The expression is peculiar. 𝕾 Gr. Be.[K] דַּרְכִּי וְעָמְדִי, my way and my standing; poor (contrast Ps. 139^{3}): Bu. דרך עמדתי, the way (on which) I stand, the verb chosen being intended to express his continuance upon it; but הלכתי—or rather אֵלֵךְ—is what in this case would be expected.

בחנני וג׳] a hypothetical sentence, as 7^{20} 21^{28b} (Dr. 154; G–K. 159*h*).

11. [אשרו] 𝔐 sing. as 31[7]: 𝔊𝔖 pl., reading אֲשֻׁרָיו (cf. pl. punctuation in, *e.g.*, Ps. 17[5]), or treating sing. as collective; cf. RV.]

אָט] The Hif. intrans., as Is. 30[11] הַטּוּ מִנֵּי ארח † (‖ סורו מִנֵּי דרך). [On the jussive form, see [9] n.]

12. מצות ש'] the *casus pendens*: (As for) the commandment of his lips, *well* (or *then*) (וְ as 15[17] 20[18] 25[5], Ps. 115[7]; Dr. 124, G–K. 143*d*: cf. ف, Qor. 3[49. 50] 26[75–77] etc.), I never seceded (Ex. 33[11]), *sc.* from it, מִמֶּנָּה being omitted in poetry for brevity. 𝔊 ἀπὸ ἐνταλμάτων αὐτοῦ καὶ (om. καί, [A]) οὐ μὴ παρέλθω, whence Me. Sgf. Be.[K] St. מִמִּצְוַת ש' לא אמיש, "nur die heb. Farbe abschwächend" (Bu.), [but obtaining a distich more easily read as 3 : 3 than 𝔐; but 14 Heb. MSS om. וְ, and this alone (without reading מִמ' for מ') gives an easy rhythm].

מחקי] EVV. "more than my necessary food," or (RVm.) "my portion": חק, as Pr. 30[8] הטריפני לחם חֻקִּי, 31[15] . . . ותתן חק לנערתיה; RVm. "more than my own law" or inclination (Ro. 7[23]). Neither is probable. Rd. with 𝔊 (ἐν δὲ κόλπῳ μου), 𝔙 (both mentioned in RVm.) בְּחֵקִי (so Reiske, Ol. Me. Di. and most).

13. באחד] usually taken as a case of ב *essent.* (Pr. 3[26], Ex. 18[4], Ps. 35[2] 118[7]; *Lex.*; G–K. 119*i*), he is *one*, viz. in purpose, and so unchangeable. But this reads a good deal into באחד; and a verb is desiderated, as (Be.) in other cases (9[12] 11[10] 31[14], Is. 43[13]) before ומי ישיבנו. Bu. and Be. independently proposed בָּחַר, *hath chosen* (‖ אִוָּהּ in Ps. 132[13], Be.); so Du.

אִוְּתָה וַיָּעַשׂ] a hypothetical sentence of the same type as 9[20] 29[11], Pr. 11[2] (Dr. 153). וְיַעַשׂ (Bu.) is no improvement: the pf. would naturally be followed by וְ.

[14. The v. is omitted in the MSS of 𝔊, though it may have formed an original part of the ancient version. V.[15] 𝔐 occurs in two translations; the first (v.[14] in Swete's text), that of 𝔊; the second is that of Theodotion: see Hatch, *Essays in Biblical Greek*, p. 217.]

כי] Sgf. Bu. כֵּן (‖ כָּהֵנָּה).

חקי] [𝔖 ܨܒܝܢܗ points to חקו; but 𝔙 *in me voluntatem suam* may well be a paraphrase of 𝔐].

עמר] [*in his mind*: for the idiom, cf. 10^{13} 15^{9}; *Lex.* 768*b*].

17. Bi. Bu. Be. Du. om. לא, and מ in [b]. Violent; but this seems necessary? [The omission of לא in MS [Ken. 48] is scarcely more than an accidental return to an original text, if such existed, from which לא was absent: the לא was already in 𝔊's text. As emended the second line ופני כסה אפל reads well—and thick darkness covereth my face—the order of the words being as in 5^{2} 14^{19} 15^{30} (Dr. 208 (1)); but [a] is not, perhaps, as a whole, so good a parallel to [b] as the parallelism of the terms חשך || אפל might lead us to expect. Still the present text is intolerable: and other proposed emendations are inferior. Sgf., retaining לא, reads נצפנתי (I was not preserved from the darkness).]

CHAPTER XXIV.

1. מִשַּׁדַּי] מן of the source, or efficient cause, as [Ps. 37^{23}, Nah. 1^{6}] (*Lex.* *s.v.* מן, 2 e (*a*)).

לא נצפנו] נצפנו being misunderstood in the sense of *are hidden*, *concealed*, has led to the omission of לא in 2 MSS, 𝕲 (*διὰ τί δὲ Κύριον ἔλαθον ὧραι;*), and by Mich. Me. Sgf. Be.: the fact that נצפן מן means *be hidden from* in Jer. 16^{17} (Be.) is not proof that it must mean it here. Du. for ^{a} [דִּין] מדוע משדי לא נצפנו עתים [עִמּוֹ] (are hidden with him).

חָזוּ] anomalously from חזה: G–K. 75*m*. Cf. Is. 16^{8} הָגְעוּ.

2. גבולות ישיגו] the half-line is short and weak; and an explicit subject is strongly desiderated. 𝕲 has *ἀσεβεῖς*, 𝕿^{1} דרא דטובעיא (the generation of the Deluge), 𝖁 *alii*, Saad. قوم (*people*). Me. Di. Bi. Sgf. Wr. Du. insert רשעים: as the emphasis lies on the deed done, the order גבולות רשעים ישיגו (as Pr. 5^{6}; Dr. 208. 2) is best. Bu. (after 𝖁) הֵמָּה (which might easily have fallen out after ימיו), followed by הֵם or הֵמָּה in v.^{5}, which he renders *some* . . . *others*; but המה points back to something definite [yet see v.^{18} n.]; and *some* . . . *others* in Heb. is not המה . . . המה, but אֵלֶּה . . . אֵלֶּה. "There are that . . ." (RV.; so ^{9}) yields, no doubt, an excellent sense; but it would require יש אשר (Neh. 5$^{2.3.4}$ †), or יש משיגים ג' (or משיגי), Pr. 11^{24} etc. (*Lex.* 441*b*, b).

ישיגו] = יסיגו (Dt. 19^{14}), from סוג (G–K. 75*ee*): cf. נָשׂוֹג for נָסוֹג (2 S. 1^{22}), and כעשׂ for כעס (on 5^{2}): G–K. 6*k*, Dr. on 2 S. 1^{22}. There is a mass. list of 18 words written once with שׂ in lieu of the normal ס (including Hos. 8^{4} השׂירו for הסירו; see RVm.); see *Mass. Magna* on Hos. 2^{8} (שָׂךְ for סָךְ), and Frensdorff, *Ochlah we-Ochlah*, no. 191, and p. 42. ס for שׂ is rarer (Am. 6^{10}, Ps. 4^{7}, Ezr. 4^{5}).

וירעו] 𝕲 (*ποίμνιον σὺν ποιμένι ἁρπάσαντες*) = וְרֹעוֹ (וְרֹעֵהוּ),

which Bu., thinking וירעו to be too obvious, adopts; so Me. Sgf. Grä. St. But (Du.) the point may be that they appropriate their neighbours' fields, and feed the flocks upon them openly and publicly, as if they were their own.

3. [For the positions of the vbs. in the two lines, cf. 20[16], Dt. 32[18. 38]; and see Gray, *Forms of Hebrew Poetry*, p. 67 n.]

4. עֲנָוֵי] so Kt.; Qrê עֲנִיֵּי. See on the distinction between עָנָו, *humble* (in disposition), and עָנִי, *humbled, afflicted* (in external state), and on the usage of the two words (especially in the Prophets and Psalms) Dr. in *DB*, *s.v.* Poor.

חֻבְּאוּ] so 𝔊 ἐκρύβησαν; yet it is doubtful whether the Pual, which occurs here only, is satisfactorily explained by saying that it indicates the violence exercised on the poor. A reflexive, not a passive, would be natural here, and we should perhaps read יתחבאו (impf. as in [a]) for יחד חבאו, the Hithp. being used of hiding in fear, or for safety as in Gn. 3[8], 1 S. 13[6]. The change also gives a rhythmically easier line.]

5. הֵן] 𝔖 ܐܝܟ, 𝔗 כ היכדין = הֵיךְ, *as* (late Heb., 1 Ch. 13[12], Dn. 10[17] †, Palm., 𝔗 [Jer.]; see *Lex.* 228*a*, 1089*b*). As a *new* class is evidently here introduced,—and one consisting, moreover, not of oppressors, but of oppressed,—a word pointing to a fresh subject is desiderated: 𝔙 again *alii*; hence Bu.'s הֵם or הֵמָּה (as v.[2]) is very plausible.

פראים] *as* wild-asses; the כ omitted, as, *e.g.*, Hos. 8[9] (G–K. 118*r*).

בפעלם] לְפ׳, as Ps. 104[23] (יצא אדם לפעלו), would be better (so 7 MSS).

משחרי לטרף] G–K. 130*a*: cf. 18[2], Is. 14[19b] 19[8], Ezk. 38[11].

ערבה לו לחם לנערים] the steppe is food for him for (the double reference of ל, as 2 K. 10[19], Hi.) the children (29[5]). After לו, לנעריו would be more natural than לַנְּעָרִים: but, though there are parallels (see on v.[6] 21[30]) for the individualizing sg. after the pl., the change is here harsh; hence in spite of Θ (ἡδύνθη—ערבה confused with עָרְבָה—αὐτῷ ἄρτος εἰς νεωτέρους) agreeing with 𝔐, the originality of לו is doubtful. [And in other respects also the present text of v.[5] must be at fault; for, as Bu. well points out, it admits of no rhythmical articulation, but simply resolves

itself into prose.] Me. Bi.[1] om. לו; Be.[K] (perhaps) משחרי לַטֶּרֶף ערבה לְלֶחֶם לְרְעֵבִים; Wr. Bu. Be.[T] משחרי לַטֶּרֶף עֲרָבָה לא לחם לנערים; Du. יֹצְאֵי בְעָרבה משחרי לַטֶּרֶף לא לחם לַנִּנְעָרִים (לנג' = *for those shaken out* of the land).

6. בלילו] 6^5. The sg. sf., which cannot naturally refer either (Del.) to שדה or (Ew. Di.) to רשע, is very harsh beside the pl. יקצירו (Dr. on 2 S. 24^{18}). And what point is there in their reaping *mixed fodder*? Would this be "reaped"? certainly not all its ingredients together? Still, if correct, it must mean they reap the ingredients of which בליל is made—the בליל would contain things (as beans) which men might eat. They have to content themselves with the coarse food of cattle. 𝔊 *ἀγρὸν πρὸ ὥρας οὐκ αὐτῶν ὄντα ἐθέρισαν* (*πρὸ ὥρας* 15^{32} = בלא יומו, 15^{33} paraphrastic for בְּסִרוֹ; *οὐκ αὐτῶν ὄντα* = בְּלִי־לוֹ, cf. 18^{15}); 𝔖 has a clear doublet: ܢܣܟܠ ܡܣܟܠܐ = בְּלִיל (PS.), and ܠܘ ܕܝܠܗܘܢ = בְּלִי־לוֹ; 𝔙 agrum non suum (בְּשדה בלי לו; cf. Gn. 15^{13}: so Hi.) demetunt, 𝔗 מדלא דלהון = בְּלִי־לוֹ. The thought of בלי לו, *what is not his* (cf. לא לו, Pr. 26^{17})—or (Hi.) in a field not his—would not be unsuitable; but the sg. pron. is a difficulty. Hence Me. Bi.[1] Sgf. Du. Be. בְּלִיל, or (Bu. Oort) בַּלַּיְלָה (בלילה first misread בְּלִילָה, and then written בְּלִילוֹ), *in the night*.

יקצירו] Qrê יִקְצוֹרוּ, the usual conj.: if בַּלַּיְלָה be read, the Ḳt. *make harvest* will be right.

ילקשו] the √ in Arab. (see Wetzstein *ap*. Del. here) is to *be* or *come late*, both it and derivatives being used in many different applications, e.g. *laḳîs* of *ripe corn*, or of a *child born late* to its parents; cf. [in Hebrew, 1. לקש, which in the Gezer Calendar Inscription (*PEFQu. St.*, 1909, p. 20 ff.) probably means the late-sowing, as according to Wetzst. does *serᵃᶜ laḳḳîs* in Tunis; note that in the Calendar the month of לקש follows the month of sowing (זרע); and 2.] מלקוש, the *late* rain of spring, = Syr. ܠܩܘܫܐ, PS. 1972 (which also in Gn. 30^{42} has the sense of ὄψιμος); hence here—not, as RV., *glean* (לִקֵּט), but—(Pi. *priv.*: G–K. 52*h*) = *take away the late-ripe fruit from* the vineyard, *i.e.* the poorest and scantiest fruit of the year. Wetzstein's objections (*ap*. Del.) to the interpretations

here given of בליל and לקש rest upon the mistaken assumption that the reference is to *plundering* tribes, who, it is true, would not, for instance, rob a vineyard except when there were plenty of ripe grapes in it; but, if the reference be to the *helpless* poor, who are obliged to be content with the coarsest and scantiest food that they can get, his objections fall through.

רשע] so all MSS and Vrss. But the ethical character of the landowner is not here in question: rd. prob. עָשִׁר, Bu. Be. Du. Oo.

7. ערום ילינו] for the syntax, see on 12[17]. The similarity of [7a] to [10] suggests that one has been assimilated to the other by some mistake: Bu. proposes for [7a] בַּחוּץ יָלִינוּ מִסְּבָה. [Du. rejects [7a] as a mere variant of [10a].]

8. ירטבו †] see on 8[16].

9. שֹׁד] so Is. 60[16] 66[11] †; elsewhere (Jb. 3[12] al.) שַׁד. If correct, cf. the rare Arab. form *thudd*. (Lane, 333); but rd. prob. שֹׁד, the pointing שַׁד being intended (each time) to express the meaning *plunder*: cf. 𝕿—בִּיזָא (here יאנסון מִבִּיזַת ייתם). So Nö. *Beitr.* ii. 121; Levy, *ChWb.* i. 87*b*.

ועל עני יחבלו] if correct, and take pledges (getting power) *over* the poor. But rd. probably עֻל, take *the infant* (Is. 65[20]) of the poor in pledge: so Kamph. Du. Bu.; Grä. עֹלֵל. The v. coheres badly with the context: vv.[6–8] and vv.[10–11] both describe the sufferings of the helpless, v.[9] describes the inhumanity of the heartless. Stud. Honth. would place it after [8] (where it would describe the violence done to the *persons* of the poor, while v.[8] describes the violence done to their *possessions*); but the repetition of the same words יתום and יחבלו are somewhat against this being its original place. The alternative is to regard it as a marginal gloss (Sgf. Bi. Bu. Be. Du. St.).

10, 11. [Lines [10b. 11b] are such exact parallels (on the particular form of parallelism, see *Forms*, p. 70) that in all probability they originally formed two stichoi of the same distich. The simplest theory is, perhaps, that [10b] originally followed [11b]; and that [10a. 11a], which seem in a somewhat corrupt form, constituted another distich. The alternative is to regard [10a] as a variant of [7a], and [11a] as a variant of [6a] (?).

Bu. assumes that the idea of the contrast between the condition of the workers and the work they do was conveyed in two distichs and by four examples: this is possible, though scarcely probable; for Bu. is compelled to assume that the point in [10a] has been lost through the substitution of בלי לבוש from v.[7] for words that had dropped out or become illegible, and to secure the idea in [11b] by rendering "between [*dark*] walls they press the oil," *i.e.* produce the means of *light*—a rather artificial interpretation. But even if Bu.'s theory of [10a] and [11a] were correct, the transposition suggested above would remain probable; for hunger and thirst, nakedness and darkness are a more probable pair of parallelisms than nakedness and hunger, darkness and thirst. For another probable example of separation through textual dislocations of lines originally parallel, see *Isaiah* (I.C.C.), p. 219, on Is. $11^{6.7}$.]

10. רעבים] accus. of state: G–K. 118*n*.

11. שורותם] the sf. has no antecedent: rd. either the du. שורותַיִם (Be. Honth. Bu. alt.), or simply שׁוּרוֹת. A fem. of שור, *wall*, is unknown in either Heb. or Aram.; שׁוּרָה is a *row*, as Jer. 5^{10} (rd. בְּשֻׁרוֹתֶיהָ), and in the Talm. (עשוין שורות שורות ככרם, men arranged *in rows* as (vines) in a vineyard: *NHWB* iv. 425).

יצהירו †] denom. fr. יִצְהָר, *make fresh oil*. 𝔙 meridiati sunt, from צהרים; cf. Parchon, ויש אמרים כל זְמַן הצהרים ישבו בין שורות הגפנים לשמוח בימי הקיץ.

יקבים] יקב is properly (*v.* Arab. in *Lex.*) a *cavity*,—usually of the cavity in the rocky ground into which the expressed juice ran down from the גת: here, as Is. 16^{10}, of the cavity (גת) in which it was trodden out of the grapes (cf. *EB* iv. 5311 ff.).

ויצמאו] Du. (supposing field-*robbers* to be alluded to in vv.[10b. 11]) וַיְנַמְּאוּ (39^{24}), *and quaff* it *down*.

12. מעיר וג׳] Whether (as accents) עיר and מתים are connected, as Dt. 2^{34} 3^{6} + Jg. 20^{48} † (rd. מְתִים for מְתֹם), *out of the city of men people groan*, or מתים is subj., *out of the city men groan*, the sense is weak, and the ‖ to חללים incomplete: rd. with 𝔖 and MS [Ken. 100] מֵתִים, *the dying* (as Gn. 20^{3}; and as subj. Zec. 11^{9}, Ezk. 18^{32} במות הַמֵּת).

ינאקו] Ezk. 30^{24} †: cf. אָנַק. 𝔊 *οἱ ἐκ πόλεως καὶ οἴκων ἰδίων*

ἐξεβάλλοντο: whence for מתים, Me. מִבָּתִּים, Bi. Du. Be.[K] וּבָתִּים; and for יִנאקו, Me. יְנֻדְּחוּ, Bi. יָנֻחוּ, Du. this or יְנֻדְּחוּ (rather יְנֻדָּחוּ, as Me.), Be.[K] נָקוֹאוּ (Jon. 2[11]), *are vomited forth* (!).

חללים] 𝔊 (νηπίων) Me. Bi. Du. Be.[K] עֹלָלִים. But (Bu.) "נפש decidedly supports חללים." חלל, *wounded*, as Ezk. 26[15] 30[24] (וְנָאַק נַאֲקוֹת חלל), Jer. 51[52].

לא ישים תפלה] understand either בָּם = *imputeth* (4[18], 1 S. 22[15]) *not unsavouriness* (to them), or אֶל לִבּוֹ (as 4[20], Is. 41[20]), *putteth it not* . . . (to his heart) = *regardeth it not*. [On תִּפְלָה, see 1[22] n.] But 2 MSS 𝔖 תְּפִלָּה; and so Geig. (*Urschr.* 333) Grä. Bu.[2] St. לֹא יִשְׁמַע תְּפִלָּה, perhaps rightly.

13. המה] *Those*,—pointing commonly to persons mentioned before; but here, if correct, pointing to persons whom the poet is thinking of or has in his mind's eye; cf. Is. 24[14].

לא] [𝔖 and one of two doublets in 𝔊 (καὶ οὐκ ἐπέγνωσαν . . . οὐκ ᾔδεισαν) ולא, which is rhythmically easier].

יָשְׁבוּ] [4 MSS יָשׁוּבוּ. 𝔊 ἐπορεύθησαν, 𝔖 ܘܗܠܟܘ would point to הָלְכוּ rather than (Be.) יֵלְכוּ (so MS de Rossi 31): note also the pf. in the previous line].

14. לאור] We expect from v.[13a] an enumeration of persons who rise not *at* day-break, but before it, in the dark: rd. with Carey, Wr. Reifm. Be. Sgf. Perles, Bu. etc., לא אור = *Before the light* (cf. 22[16] לא עת = *before* the time); לא, as 34[24], Ps. 59[4]; cf. בלי, v.[10] 8[11] 31[39] (G–K. 152*u*).

יקטל] = *that he may* kill: cf. G–K. 120*c*; and in Arab. Dr. 185 (on § 27); Wright, *Ar. Gr.* ii. § 8*d*.

עני ואביון] Du. צָרוֹ וְאֹיְבוֹ, thinking that the murderer would have no motive for killing the poor. But the practice is attested by the Psalmists; see Ps. 10[8. 9] 37[14].

ויהי כגנב] the jussive is out of place, and the comparison is weak. Me., cleverly and convincingly, יְהַלֵּךְ גַּנָּב: so Wr. Di.[2] Sgf. Bu. etc. The clause is probably out of place, and should follow [15]: we then get a subj. for חתר in [16].

15. שָׁמְרָה] tone, as 3[3] (see *n*.).

וסתר פנים ישים] *setteth*, = *putteth* on, a *face-covering* (cf. הסתיר פנים, Ps. 10[11] etc.): ישים (abs.), as Ezk. 30[21].

16a. [חתר] cstr. with the acc. (בתים) as often in NH. (see examples in Levy): elsewhere in OT. the vb. is construed with ב, Ezk. 8^8 $12^{5.\,7\,(12)}$, Am. 9^2. The *digging through* implied by the vb. may be to gain entrance (Am. 9^2), or exit (Ezk. 12^{12}); Du. renders "sie *brechen . . . aus*"; but why any of the classes mentioned here should need to dig their way *out* either of other-people's houses (which the pl. בתים after the sing. חתר most naturally suggests), or their own (which would preferably be expressed by ביתו), is not obvious. Render: he diggeth (his way) in the darkness into houses. This is scarcely applicable to either murderers or adulterers; but most applicable to burglars whose violent entry into the wattle and clay-built houses of Palestine was spoken of as a *digging through* (מחתרת, Ex. 22^1, Jer. 2^{34}; cf. *κλέπται διορύσσουσι*, Mt. 6^{19}). The probability that ^{14b} (mentioning the thief) immediately preceded ^{16a} (describing a proverbial activity of the thief) is, therefore, great. Moreover, the present text appears to devote two stichoi ($^{14a.\,b}$) to the murderer, one only to the thief (^{14c}), three to the adulterer ($^{15a.\,b.\,c}$); the transposition gives two ($^{14c.\,16a}$) rather than three ($^{14c.\,16a.\,16b}$) (see below) to the thief. Du. defends the existing arrangement of the text on the ground that the thief was too vulgar a character to be worth more than a single stichos. Yet a further point in favour of connecting ^{14c} with ^{16a}, which at the same time favours separating ^{16a} and ^{16b}: in ^{16a} חתר is sing., in ^{16b} חתמו is pl.: Be.^{K} would assimilate by reading חתם in ^{16b} or, with 𝔖, חתרו in ^{16a}. But if ^{16a} goes with ^{14c} the sing. is right; and if ^{16b} goes with ^{16c} the pl. in ^{b} is right. Then the section begins v.^{13} with a general description of the avoiders of light in the pl., in $^{14-16a}$ describes three classes of them separately in the sing., and then $^{16b-17}$ (in ^{17b} read יכירו) concludes with a general description in the pl.—a very natural and appropriate arrangement.]

16. [חתמו למו] have *sealed themselves up*, fig. for *shut themselves up*. So only here: the only passages cited by PS. and Levy for the same sense in Aram. is this in 𝔖𝔗. למו, the acc., as אבן לו, 9^{11}. [If למו is a late (5^2 n.) equivalent for אותם, cf. G-K. 135*k*.]

16c. 𝔊 (Θ) agrees with 𝔐; but "[16c] is too short and [17a] is too long; transpose, therefore, יחדו to [16c]" (Bu.).

17. בקר] Du. בְּחֵרוּ, 𝔖 Be. בְּקָרוּ, destroying the forcible fig. of the Heb.; and would בָּקָר (v. *Lex.*) be suitable here?

יכיר] [b] is so closely connected with [a] (note כי) that יכירו would be better.

בלהות] Du. הֲלִכוֹת (cf. [18] דְּרָכָיו), with עֲלָטָה (or a synonym) for צלמות (repeated by error from [a]) [a common form of error: see Gray, *Forms*, p. 295 f.].

18. קל הוא] so 𝔊 (Θ); but (cf. [b]) Bu. Be. Oo. קַלּוּ. Du. keeps 𝔐, making [18a] ("if not wholly corrupt") the end of [17], but giving the words a strained sense.

על פני מים] Be. (with a?) לפני יוֹמָם, "before their day" (cf. 15^{32}); but קלו means "*move* swiftly," not "*pass away* swiftly."

לא יפנה דֶּרֶךְ כרמים] Bi. Be. Bu. Ho. לא יפנה דֹּרֵךְ כַּרְמָם, "no treader (Is. 16^{10}) turneth towards their vineyard," because, viz., there are no grapes in it to tread. [In 𝔐 the same sing. subj. as in [a] reappears after the pl. in [b]. The idiom is as in 1 S. 13^{18}; דרך כ׳, *the way of*, i.e. *to*, as Gn. 3^{24}.]

19. [גם] as Ps. 107^5: see *Lex.* s.v. גם, **1**, end.]

שאול חטאו] G–K. 155*n*,—though the ellipse is hard: [a] and [b] also balance each other very imperfectly. [Nor does the v. yield a good example of 2 : 2 : 2; cf. *Forms*, 171*n*. and p. 182.] It is, however, difficult to emend satisfactorily. 𝔊 for שאול חטאו has *εἶτ' ἀνεμνήσθη αὐτοῦ ἡ ἁμαρτία*, seemingly (Bi.) = שְׁאוֹל חֶטְאוֹ (*is asked for*),—*i.e.* the same consonants: 𝔙 also has *peccatum eius.* "Snow water" may have been specified as poor in quality, and not fed from a source, so that it rapidly dries up. It is possible that מים and שלג were originally variants, afterwards combined into מימי שלג; Bu. omits מימי. Grimme ציה גם חם ינזלו מַיִם יַשְׁלֵךְ שְׁאוֹל חֵטְא; but (Bu.) would not תִּשְׁאַל be preferable to ישלך? כֵּן or וְ ($14^{11f. 19}$) would express the comparison more distinctly; and [b], if it were necessary, might be re-written more forcibly ושאול חַטָּאִים תַּחְטֹף (Ps. 10^9), or ושאול חַטָּאִים יֵחָתוּ (*go down* to Sheol).

20. מְתָקוֹ רִמָּה] the msc. vb. by G–K. 145*o*, though מְתָקַתּוּ

would be an easy emendation. The structure of the verse is, however, unusual, consisting of four clauses, the first three being very short. Those who think that metre will not permit this, accordingly emend; though surely the context would make it plain what רחם was intended, and Bu.'s contention that, if the word were right, רַחְמוֹ or רֶחֶם אִמּוֹ would be expected, is more than can be maintained. Be. Du. Bu. for * read יִשְׁכָּחֵהוּ רְחֹב מְקֹמוֹ רָמֹה עוֹד לֹא יִזָּכֵר. רחב מקמו is unexceptionable (cf. שער מקמו, Ru. 4^{10}, Be.); but רָמֹה, to judge from usage, would mean only *his* (physical) *loftiness* (Pr. 25^{3}), or *his haughtiness* (Is. $2^{11. 17}$); it is thus not "seine *Grösse*" (Be., Bu. text); and "seine *Erhebung*" (Bu. note) would be rather שְׂאֵתוֹ. The context speaks only of ordinary men, not of one of whom "exaltation" (in any sense of the word) may be specially predicated. רָמֹה for רִמָּה is thus doubtful. [Yet it remains probable that לא יזכר is the parallel term to ישכחהו (cf. the parallelism in Is. 54^{4}), the one term standing at the beginning of the first line, the other at the end of the second line of a 3 : 3 distich—a frequent and effective scheme of parallelism (Gray, *Forms*, p. 69 f.). To avoid the objections urged against רָמֹה, we might read שְׁמֹה (cf. Ps. 83^{5}) and so obtain, by adopting also the above emendation of the first line, an effective and rhythmically regular distich:

> The square of his (native-) place forgetteth him,
> And his name is remembered no more;

then cf. 18^{17}.]

מתקו] מָתַק will not mean "feed sweetly on" (EVV.), but have the common Syr. sense of the √, to *suck*.

ותשבר] Bu. וְתִשָּׁבֵר, needlessly.

21. רעה] רעה, to *graze on*, is used fig. of foes *depasturing* or *stripping* a country (Mic. 5^{5}; cf. Jer. 6^{3}), and even (if the text is right) the *head* (Jer. 2^{16} יִרְעוּךְ קָדְקֹד); also of the wind (Jer. 22^{22}), or fire (Jb. 20^{26}), *feeding on* people; but it is a strange fig. to use of one "fleecing" (as we might say) a woman who is barren. 𝕿 דמרע; Be. Bu. הֵרַע, *ill-treateth* (sq. acc., as Nu. 16^{15}, 1 S. 25^{34} al.).

וַיְּיַשֵּׁב] G-K. 70*d*. Rd. יֵיטִיב.

22. 'ומשך וג] The subj. must be God—whether He is not named, whether, as 3[20], from a sense of reverence (Di.), or simply from its being evident from the context who is intended (Di. on 3[20] cites for this 8[18] 12[13] 16[7] 20[23] 22[21] 25[2] 27[22] 30[19]), or whether (Bu.) the name should be restored (וְאֵל משך אַבִּיר בכחו). משך, to *draw out*, *continue*, *prolong*, elsewhere of mercy, Ps. 36[11] 109[12] (cf. Neh. 9[30]), anger (Ps. 85[6]), here in the sense of *maintaining in life*. Buhl, Be.[T] ומשך אַבִּיר יָמָיו בכחו, "and the mighty *prolongs his life* by his strength," making the אביר himself determine the length of his life; but (Bu.) the agent (v.[23]) is God. Bi.[2] Be.[K] Du., attaching the clause to [21] and making the godless the subject, read אֹבְדִים (𝔊 ἀδυνάτους) for אבירים, giving the clause an entirely different sense, *and draweth away* (to destruction: Ps. 28[3], cf. 10[9]) *them that are perishing by his might*.

ולא יאמין] a circumstantial cl. = *when* (or *though*) he believeth not, etc. (42[3], Is. 45[4. 5], Ps. 44[18] 139[16]; Dr. 159, end).

בחיין] G-K. 87*e*; cf. on 4[2]. But rd. probably בְּחַיָּיו (so 3 MSS: it cannot be proved that 𝔊𝔖𝔙 *read* בחייו). [The singulars in [22b]—יקום, יאמין—if parallel (as in 𝔐) to the pl. אבירים in [22a], though this would not be without analogy (21[30] n), are suspicious. It would be easy to read יקומו לא־יאמינו בחיין (or, less easily, בחייהם). Du. (after Bi.) connects [22b] with [23a], which is like [22b] 𝔐 in the sing., and also with [23b] where he emends to דרכו: reading יָקֻם for יקום, חייו for חיין, and יִתֵּן לא יבטח for יתן לו לבטח (thus getting rid of לו (see next n.)), he obtains a good balanced parallelism for [22b], [23a].

If he is punished, he reckons not on his life,
 If he is pulled down, he has no hope of finding support.]

23. לָבֶטַח] if correct, must be for לִהְיוֹת לָבֶטַח; but this is very forced. Rd. (Bu. Be.) לִבְטֹחַ; cf. 2 Ch. 20[10] (more commonly with acc. of obj., as Gn. 20[6] לא נתתיך לִנְגֹּעַ, or Nu. 21[23] ולא נתן את ישראל עֲבֹר: *Lex*. 679*a*, g).

ועיניהו] so, with a dual or pl. noun, only 7 times (G-K. 91*l*

[add 1 S. 14[48], Pr. 29[18]]; Ols. 248, Sta. 206; Wright, *Comp. Gr.* 158): with a *sing.* noun, see on 25[3]. [But the form here may be corrupt: the line is short, and 𝔊 (ἀλλὰ πεσεῖται νόσῳ) appears to differ from 𝔐: עיני יהוה would be an easy emendation, but against the usage of the book: עיני אֱלוֹהַּ more difficult.]

24. [רוֹמּוּ] a very remarkable form: apparently from רָמַם, of the form יְכֹל, assumed to have been a ‖ form of רום; cf. רֹבּוּ, Gn. 49[23]: Kön. i. 335 f., G–K. 69*m*. But, if the verb is right (*v.i.*), there is no reason why רָמּוּ should not be read.

[ואיננו] the sg. may stand, even if רומו be retained (cf. Jer. 31[15] מְבַכָּה עַל בָּנֶיהָ כִּי אֵינֶנּוּ): if רומו be read, it, of course, occasions no difficulty. The pl. in 𝔖𝔙 is merely accommodation to Syr. and Lat. idiom, and not proof that the translators *read* וְאֵינָם, or even וְאֵינֵמוֹ: EVV. have "*they* are not"; and their translators certainly read ואיננו. If the v. describes (as a mark of God's favour) the quick and easy death of the oppressor, we must render (Ew. Del. Di.), "They are exalted: (yet) a little while, and they are not" (cf. עוד מעט וְ, Ex. 17[4] al.); if it describes (as a mark of God's disfavour) his rapid fall, it is more natural to render (though Bu., adopting the same view, renders as Ew. etc.), "They are exalted for a little, and they are not"; or, reading with 𝔊 (τὸ ὕψωμα αὐτοῦ), Bi. Du. Be.[K], רומו, "*His exaltation* is but for a little, and he is not."

[הֻמְּכוּ] G–K. 67*y*; cf. וַיַּכְּתוּ, Dt. 1[44]; תַּתֻּם, c. 22[3]. מכך to be *brought low*, Ps. 106[43], Qoh. 10[18] †: in Pesh. ܡܟܟ stands for עָנָה, ταπεινόω, and ܐܡܟ for הֵשַׁח or הִשְׁפִּיל (Is. 25[6] 26[5]). [Du. (cp. Be.[K]) reads הֻמַּךְ, יִקָּפֵץ, יִמַּל all in the sing., supposing that the plurals were substituted in consequence of רומו being misunderstood as a vb. in the pl. Yet would such a scribal emender have varied the pl. endings—ן, once, ּ, twice?]

[ככל] הַכֹּל = *the totality of all things*, is rather common in late Heb. (*Lex.* כֹּל, 2b, *b*); but hardly in the sense of *all men*. Nu. 16[29] is compared; but אִם כְּמוֹת כָּל־אדם is not parallel ([cp. rather] 1 Ch. 29[12] end). 𝔊 ὥσπερ μολοχή = כַּמַּלּוּחַ (30[4]), as *mallows*, or *salt-wort*, a desert plant, which grows abundantly

in salt marshes and on the shores of the Mediterranean and Dead Sea. The ‖ in ^{c} strongly supports a plant (Be.).

יקפצון] קפץ is to *draw together*, *shut close*, especially of the hand (Dt. 15^7) and mouth (c. 5^{16}); here, if correct, *draw themselves together*, *contract themselves* in death (Di. Bu.: EVV. *are taken out of the way*, RVm. *are gathered in*, are both too free paraphrases: AVm. correctly, "Heb. *are closed up*"). Ol. Hont. MS $^{\text{Ken. 228}}$ יִקָּבְצוּן (for burial, Hos. 9^6, Ezk. 29^5; unduly anticipating ^{c}, Di.); Be.^{T} Sgf. יִקָּמְטוּן, *are plucked off* (8^{12}; 30^4 of mallows).

יִמַּלוּ] So Ps. 37^2. An incorrect form for יִמַּלּוּ (in pause), from מלל—Qal, if the meaning be *are withered*, Nif. if it be *are cut off* (see on 14^2).

25. ואם לא אפו] 9^{24b}.

וְיָשֵׂם] rd. וְיָשִׂם; 2 MSS have יָשִׂים. Cf. on 13^{27}.

לְאַל] אַל only here as a subst. The use is against analogy, and the meaning of אַל: rd. probably לְאַיִן; see Is. 40^{23} הנותן רוזנים לְאָיִן (cf. כְּאַיִן, Is. 40^{17} $41^{11.\,12}$).

CHAPTER XXV.

2. הַמְשֵׁל] Inf. abs., with force of a subst.; cf. הַשְׁמֵד, Is. 14[23]; הַפְצֵר (in p. הַפְצַר), 1 S. 15[23]; Ew. § 156*c*; G-K. 85*c* (but this form is not mentioned).

עִשָּׂה] in loose apposition to the sf. in עִמּוֹ; cf. on 12[17].

3. אוֹרְהוּ] the sf., as in לְמִינֵהוּ, Gn. 1[12. 12] (+12 times); פִּילַגְשֵׁהוּ, Jg. 19[24]; סוּפָתֵהוּ, Nah. 1[13] † (G-K. 91*d*; Wright, *C. Gr.* 155). Cf., with a pl. noun, 24[23]. 𝔊 μὴ γάρ τις ὑπολάβοι ὅτι ἐστὶν παρέλκυσις (*delay*: HP 248 *marg.*, cited by Be., explains by ὑπέρθεσις τῆς τιμωρίας) πειραταῖς (= גדוד, Hos. 6[9]; cf. πειρατήριον = גדוד, 19[12], Gn. 49[19], Ps. 17 (18)[29]); ἐπὶ τίνας δὲ οὐκ ἐπελεύσεται ἔνεδρα παρ' αὐτοῦ; whence Du. Be.[K] אֹרְבוֹ, "And against whom will *his ambush* not arise?"

5. עַד] like Lat. *adeo* = *even*: elsewhere, except 1 S. 2[5] עַד־עֲקָרָה יָלְדָה שִׁבְעָה (where the text is dub.; *v.* Comm.), only with a *neg.*, Ex. 14[28] (לֹא נשאר עד אֶחָד), al. (*Lex.* 724*b*, 3).

וְלֹא] וְ after the *casus pendens*; Dr. 124; G-K. 143*d*; cf. 15[17] 20[18b] 23[12]. But 47 MSS have לֹא alone.

יאהיל] for יָהֵל, 31[26], Is. 13[10] (cf. c. 41[10] יָהֶל־); and no doubt an error for it. 𝔊 ἐπιφαύσκει.

CHAPTER XXVI.

2. ללא כח] poetical for לאשר לא כח לו; so ^{3a}; Is 40^{29} לאין אונים = לאשר אין לו אונים, 59^{10} כְּאֵין עינים, 2 Ch. 14^{10} לְאֵין כח: G–K. 152*v*, 155*n* (*d*).

לא עז] a circumstantial clause qualifying זרוע = *strengthless*: see on 12^{24}.

3. תושיה] see on 5^{12}.

לָרב] *according to* abundance = *abundantly* (*Lex.* 516 i, 914*a*), especially frequent in Chr. (Dr. *LOT.*^{9} p. 535 (no. 2)). Grä. לְבַעַר, *to the boorish*; Rsk. Be.^{K} לְרַךְ (to assimilate the line in form to ^{2} and ^{3a}).

4. את מי] הגיד with acc. of the person told is rare and doubtful: 2 S. 15^{31} rd. ולדוד הגיד; 2 K. $7^{9.\ 11}$ בית המלך may be quite naturally understood as "*in* the king's palace"; Jb. 17^{5} רעים are the people reported *about* (as Jer. 20^{10}): 31^{37} may be explained by G–K. 117*x*; there remains only this passage and Ezk. 43^{10}. Rd. probably אל (Ex. 19^{9} al.) for את in both; [or with Du., treat את מי as equal to *with whose help* (cf. ^{b}); את = *with the help of* (*Lex.* 86*a*, top), is rare, and the examples on one ground or another more or less uncertain: see Gn. 4^{1} 49^{25}, Mic. 3^{8}; but cf. עם, 1 S. 14^{45}].

5. [In respect both of rhythm and parallelism, the text is open to suspicion. In 𝔐 (יחוֹלָלוּ מתחת) the rhythm is very anomalous (2 : 3; cf. *Forms*, 176 ff.), parallelism non-existent, and the cæsura between ^{a} and ^{b} very slight; if, with Ley, Ehrlich, we place the athnakh under מִתַּחַת, parallelism is obtained, and a rhythm (3 : 2) which, though uncommon in Job, is not unparalleled (17^{13} n.); the particular type of parallelism, however, though common enough elsewhere (*Forms*, 75 f.), would be very unusual in Job, and the sense not altogether satisfactory. The emendations which have been

suggested only partly obviate the questionable form of the verse, or fail to improve the sense. In addition to the conjectures noticed below, the following may be mentioned: הֵן רפאים for הרפאים (Be.[T]); insert ממנו, מפניו, מקולו, or the like, before מתחת (Bu., if [a] be considered too short).]

[הָרפאים] 𝔐; but 𝔊 (= Θ) μὴ γίγαντες μαιωθήσονται; Σ μὴ θεομάχοι θορυβήσουσιν; Ἀ μήτι ῥαφαειμ ὠδίνουσιν, all read הָרפאים; and so Richter.]

יחוללו] if correct, Poʿlel of חול, *are made to tremble* (properly, it seems, to *turn* or *writhe* in pain, then, more generally, to *quiver* in fear), though the Poʿlel does not occur in the sense of *make to tremble*: the Hithpoʿlel מתחולל does, however, mean (15^{20}) *writhing* in pain = (mentally) *tormented*. Grimme, Bu. יָחִלוּ לוֹ, "tremble before him"; but חול is construed only with מפני (Ps. 96^9 al.) or מלפני (Ps. 114^7): יָרֵא and פָּחַד also are construed not with לְ, but with מִן or מפני. If יחוללו is deemed doubtful, יָחִילוּ or יָחִילוּ must be read. AV. *are formed* (to *form*, also, in AV. for חולל, v.[18], Dt. 32^{18}, Pr. 26^{10}; to *make*, c. 15^7; in AV. and RV. Ps. 90^2; *was shapen*, Ps. $51^{7(5)}$, AV. RV.) is a misrendering due to Ḳimchi (ענין יְצִירָה): חוֹלֵל may indeed mean to *give birth to* (lit. to *be in pain* with), but not to *form* or *shape*: to *be brought forth*, however, is not here a suitable sense. [Ἀ, Richter יחוֹלְלוּ—I could believe the Titans were in labour, and their defiant spirit finding utterance in you; but this is very forced.]

מתחת] = תחת or מתחת לְ, as Gn. 1^9 [but here possibly = *from under*], Ezk. 1^8 [here possibly = (projecting) *from under*] 42^9 46^{23} (*Lex.* 1066*a*, **III. 2a** [G–K. 119*c*]). Be. needlessly, יֵחַתּוּ [Ley, מְפַתַּחַת—and so Ehrlich, to improve the parallelism and avoid מת׳ מים for מת׳ למים].

ושׁכניהם] Me. Bi.[1] Du. Honth. St. מִשְׁכְּנֵיהֶם (without וְ), "beneath the waters are their dwellings" = whose dwellings are beneath the waters; [but this is poor in sense, in addition to leaving the rhythm (2 : 3) as questionable, and the parallelism as imperfect as in 𝔐. Richter יִשְׁכְּנוּ, carrying forward הם—corrected to הֵן—to v.[6]].

6. . . . ערום . . . ואין כסות] cf. 24^7.

7. נטה] for the ptcp. in loose apposition to the suffix in ענו, see on 12[19].

בְּלִימָה] a poet. compound = בְּלִי מָה, (what is) *not aught* (*Lex.* 116*a*, 553*b*, 3).

8. צְרֹר מַ֫יִם] צֹ֫רֵר, with "incomplete retrocession" of the tone; the tone of צֹרֵר being thrown back, because of the following tone-syll. (מַ֫יִם), but the long vowel *sērē* retained, though in a closed toneless syll., by the metheg (G–K. 29*f*; Baer, *Metheg-Setzung*, § 13); cf. Nu. 24[22].

9. מְאַחֵז] The Pi. only here; but (Be. Du.) the מ may be dittographed from [8b (end)], in which case אֹחֵז will be read. אָחַז, usually to *take hold* of, has sometimes, in speaking of a building, the sense of to *fasten together* (1 K. 6[10]; Hof. 2 Ch. 9[18]); but here, it seems, it must have (as in Neh. 7[3] of gates) the Aram. sense of *holding* (with a bar), *i.e.* of *shutting*, *closing in* (so أحد = κλείειν, Mt. 6[6] and often; PS. 115–116).

פְּנֵי כִסֵּה] כִּסֵּה, as 1 K. 10[19], for כִּסֵּא, which is read by some 70 MSS. But the pronoun is needed: rd. (Hi. al.) כִּסְאֹה (ה־ = ו: Dr. *Samuel*[2], xxxii f.; G–K. 91*e*) or כִּסְאוֹ. Du. Be.[K] פִּנֵּי כ׳, holdeth firm the *corner-stones* of his throne; but פִּנֵּי for פִּנּוֹת is a doubtful form; שַׁעַר הַפִּנִּים, Zec. 14[10], is open to the suspicion of being an error for שער הַפִּנָּה, as 2 K. 14[13], Jer. 31[38], 2 Ch. 26[9]†; if correct, also, פִּנִּים, like פִּנּוֹת, Zeph. 1[16] 3[6], 2 Ch. 26[15], will mean probably *fortified corners*, *battlements*: for פִּנָּה, Pr. 7[8], see on 11[9]. For "pillars" (Strahan) there is no support. I.E. Hi. Wr. Bu. Be. for כִּסֵּה point כֶּסֶה (Ps. 81[4], Pr. 7[20] כֶּסֶא †), *full-moon*; but some important fact relating to the structure, or permanent order, of heaven or earth would be expected, rather than the mere closing in of the face of the moon, whether by clouds or by an eclipse.

פַּרְשֵׁז] so, with MSS in general, Kit. Gi.; Baer—partly (see p. 48) on the authority of two good MSS (F = a Frankfurt Cod. of A.D. 1294, and H = one of Heidenheim's), and partly because ancient renderings (*v.i.*) and explanations presuppose פרשׂ, to *spread out*, not פרשׁ, to *separate* or *divide*—פַּרְשֵׂז. The latter is etymologically better; for, however the word be explained, the meaning is evidently *spreading out*; and this

is expressed not by פָּרַשׂ, but by פַּרְשֵׁז. The form is anomalous: in any case it is an inf. abs. (Hi. De. etc.), not a pf. (which would be פִּרְשֵׁז), to be explained by G–K. 113*h*. As it stands, it is a quadriliteral form, derived (Del., G–K. 56) from a Pilʿel פַּרְשֵׁשׁ, with a "euphonic" change of the first שׁ to שׂ, and of the second to ז, or (Kön. ii. 464) by dissimilation from פַּרְשֵׂשׂ (though פרשׁ is to *separate*, not to *spread out*). But these explanations are highly artificial; and it is far more probable that פרשז is merely a textual error for פרשׂ—whether this be vocalized (Hfm., Stade (*WB.*), Du.) פָּרֹשׂ, or better (Bu.) פָּרֹשׂ (inf. abs. from פָּרַשׂ, to *spread out*). 𝔊 (Θ) ἐκπετάζων, 𝔖 ܦܪܣ, 𝔗 פרס, 𝔙 expandit.

10. חֹק חָג] חָג †, if correct, will mean to *circumscribe*; so 𝔊 πρόσταγμα ἐγύρωσεν, Σ ὅρον περιέγραψεν, 𝔙 terminum circumdedit aquis: cf. Syr. ܚܓ, *circumivit*, once (PS. 1217 from Bar Hebræus) *circumduxit*, "he *drew round* a circle (ܚܓ ܗܘܐ ܚܘܓܐ) on the earth"; ܚܘܓܐ, a *circle*, γῦρος, PS. 1217*f*; and מְחוּגָה, a *circumscribing* instrument, *i.e.* a *compass*, Is. 44^{13} †: Levy quotes from 𝔗 only חָג חוּגְתָא, Pr. 8^{27} (𝔖 ܟܕ ܚܓ ܚܘܓܐ, Heb. בְּחֻקוֹ חוּג), and *Taʿanith* 3^8 עג עוגה ועמד בתוכה (= חג חוגה), *drew a circle*, and stood in its midst. חֹק, as was pointed out on 14^5, means *something prescribed*—in different applications, there and 14^{13} a *prescribed limit* in time; here and 38^{10} (see *n.*), if 𝔐 is right, it will mean a *prescribed limit* in space, or a *bound*; in Jer. 5^{22}, Pr. 8^{29} (בשׂומו לַיָּם חֻקּוֹ), Ps. 148^6 (all of the sea), however, the sense *decree*, *ordinance*, suffices—in Jer. 5^{22} גבול is the *physical* boundary. But the ‖ Pr. 8^{27} בהכינו שׁמים שׁם אני בְּחֻקוֹ חוּג על פני תהום strongly supports the conjecture (Mich. Hfm. Bu. Du. Be.; cf. 𝔗 גְּזַר למשׁרי רקיע, 𝔖 ܚܓ ܚܘܓܐ ܥܠ ܐܦܝ ܡܝܐ) חָק חוּג—or better, as the biliteral form in the 3 pp. of verbs ע״ע is usually intransitive (G–K. 67*bb*), חָקַק חוּג—he hath *marked out* a *circle* (the horizon) on the face of the waters: for the sense of חקק see Pr. 8^{29} בְּחוּקוֹ מוסדי ארץ (unless 𝔊 בְּחַזְּקוֹ is to be read), as well as 8^{27}. In 22^{14} (see *n.*), Is. 40^{22} חוּג must denote the vault of heaven (apparently) resting upon the horizon.

[עד] Be.[K] "prps. יעד," *i.e.* "he hath appointed"; a vb. would improve the parallelism, but this is scarcely the vb. that would be expected here.]

11. ירופפו †] Ar. *raffa* means (among many other things) to *quiver* or *throb* (of the eye), and *rafrafa* to *flap* (the wings); see Lane, 1116*a*, *b*: and Levy quotes from 𝕿 Jb. 9[6] עמודיה מתרפפין (= יתפלצון), Gn. 44[18 Ps.-J.] ורפפיה, and *shook* it (the pillar supporting the palace).

12. רגע] רגע (1) is to *stir up* (Is. 51[15] = Jer. 31[35] רֹגַע הים ויהמו גליו); רגע (2) to *be at rest* (on the etymology of both words, *v. Lex.*); not elsewhere in Qal; but in Nif. Jer. 47[6] הֵרָגְעִי וָדֹמִּי, *repose*, and be still †, and in Hif. Jer. 31[2] 50[34] al. Whichever view (*v.s.*) be adopted of the meaning of the v., whether it is taken to refer to the *present* order of the world, or to what was supposed to have happened at its creation, either of these renderings can be adjusted to it: Hi. Del., adopting the former, render *stirs up* (and afterwards calms, by transfixing ([b]) the monster, Rahab, supposed to have disturbed it), so RV.; Di. Dav. render *quiet* (making [a] parallel to [b]); Bu. Pe., adopting the latter, render *quieted* (cf. 𝔊 κατέπαυσεν), but Du. renders *stirred up* (in the sense of, incited to the contest with Himself; cf. Daiches, *ZA*, 1911, p. 2 [who treats רגע as meaning *he conquered*, and virtually equal to *šudluḫu* in *kirbiš Tiamat šudluḫu* in the Babylonian Creation Tablet, iv. l. 48]). As (*v.s.*) the latter view of the meaning of the v. is the more probable, and as Du.'s interpretation seems gratuitous, *quieted*—or better, as this is the sense of the Hif., *was quieted*—is the best rendering. [𝕾 (but as Lyon, in *JBLit.* 1895, well points out, *not* 𝔊) Sgf. נער.]

ובתובנתו] a scribal error for וּבִתְבוּנָתוֹ; cf. similar cases in Jer. 2[25] 17[23] 32[23]. In Frensdorff's *Ochlah we-Ochlah*, § 91, there is a list of 62 such transpositions, which have been corrected by the Massorah.

13. שִׁפְרָה †] *fairness* = *fair*; subst. for adj., as Ex. 17[12] etc. (Dr. 189, ii). [On this construction, the line, containing no vb., may equally well describe past or present—either the heavens (are) fair (so 𝕾), or the heavens (were) fair (so 𝔙𝕿).]

Giesebr. Be.[K] שִׁפְּרוּ; but שִׁפְרָה is quite correct syntactically. The √ is common in Aram., but rare in Heb. (vb. Ps. 16[6] †; אִמְרֵי שָׁפֶר, Gn. 49[21] †; שַׁפְרִיר, Jer. 43[10] †; שׁוֹפָר? cognate): in Aram. it means *to be fair*, usually in the sense of to *seem fair* or *good* to any one (= Heb. יטב בעיני פ׳), but also in the sense of *to be beautiful* or *bright* (PS. 4272, ܫܦܰܪ (1), *e.g.* of gold; cf. ܫܽܘܦܪܳܐ = יֳפִי, Is. 33[17] al.). [This defence of 𝔐 is preferable to that of Daiches (*ZA*, 1911, p. 3). He regards שפרה as 3 pf. fem., the subj. being ידו in [b], and the meaning of שפר, *to spread out*: for this meaning (so already Ra.) he appeals to the obscure שפריר and to the Assyr. *šuparruru*, *to spread out* (Del. *HWB* 684); cf. *uš-pa-ri-ir-ma sa-pa-ra-šu*, *spread out his net* (Creation Tablet, iv. 95). But the construction assumed by Daiches is most improbable, if only on account of its destruction of the parallelism, and the strange combination *by his spirit his hand*: it should be obvious that if the poet meant God spread out the heavens, he would have written שפר; and (immediately before חללה, 𝔐) it would not be difficult to read so, if the difficulty of the v. is to be surmounted along Daiches' lines, but see below on חללה. In view, however, of the variants in 𝔖 (ܡܟܪ) and 𝔊, 𝔐 is not certain, even though the sense expressed by 𝔊 is not acceptable. 𝔊 renders] *κλεῖθρα δὲ οὐρανοῦ δεδοίκασιν αὐτὸν* = בְּרִיחֵי שמים שִׂעֲרָהוּ. [שערה as Dt. 32[17] (?). On Gu.'s use of this, see exegetical n.; but the criticisms of Gu.'s interpretation by] Bu., and Gie. *GGA*, 1895, p. 592 [are in part at least forcible; see also above. A third attempt to connect [13] with the Babylonian myth is due to] Lyon (*JBLit.* 1895, p. 130 ff.), who proposes for [a] ברוחות שמים שִׁבְרָהּ [(or שִׁבְרוֹ, and renders, *By the winds of heaven he broke her* (*or him*), *i.e.* the monster mentioned in the next line; but it may be doubted whether the phrase the winds *of heaven* is very likely here, and the pronoun, referring to the object not named till [b], is awkward; otherwise this is, perhaps, the most attractive attempt to find in, or restore to, the text a Babylonian allusion which the context, though it does not demand it, certainly favours. Ehrlich suggests that שמים may conceal ים or מים (cf. Ps. 74[13]), but he attempts no complete reconstruction of the

line. Neither 𝕳 nor any of the emendations leaves the impression of being exactly what the poet wrote].

[חללה] as in Is. 51^{9}, where the vb. is ‖ to המחצבת (? read המחצת), this means *pierced*, not *formed*, or *created* (𝕿; cf. 𝖁). Of creation חלל, lit. *to be in birth-pangs with*, is only used metaphorically (see on v.[5]); and with ידו here it would be, in spite of 𝖁, unsuitable. [b] does not, therefore, refer to the creation of the sea, and this being so one of Daiches' principal arguments for finding in [a] the spreading out of the heavens at creation falls to the ground.]

14. דַּרְכּוֹ] so Kt. 𝕲 (Θ); דְּרָכָיו, Qrê 𝕾𝕿𝖁.

שמץ] 4^{12}† (see n.). RVm. = AV. *how little a portion*: see *ib.*

בו] = "*of* him": the ב׳ partitive, as 21^{25}, Is. 10^{22} (Del.).

גבורתו] so Kt. 𝕲 Σ 𝕾𝕿𝖁; Qrê גבורֹתָיו = his *mighty acts* (Dt. 3^{24}, Is. 63^{15}, Ps. 106^{2} $145^{4.12}$ al.).

CHAPTER XXVII.

1. שאת] [without ל; cf. 3[8] n.].

2. חי אל הסיר . . . ושדי המר lit. *Living is God* (*who*) *hath taken away* . . . *and the Almighty who hath embittered*; for the omission of the rel., cf. G–K. 155*f*, and see on 3[8].

3. כל עוד נשמתי בי] [if this be rendered *all my breath is till in me*, it is in 𝔐] a very peculiar expression, scarcely explicable grammatically, and yet apparently supported by 2 S. 1[9] כל עוד נפשי בי. Hos. 14[3] כָּל־תִּשָּׂא עָוֺן, as it stands, is incredible Hebrew [for *thou wilt take away all iniquity*; and] even the abs. כל, as an adv. acc. = *wholly* (Di. G–K. 128*e*), is not a Hebrew idiom. RV. here and in 2 S. 1[9] "*is yet whole in me*"—unless regarded as a paraphrase—requires שְׁלֵמָה for כָּל־. 2 S. 1[9], therefore, if the text is correct, can only be explained as an unusual inversion, current in this expression, for עוד כל (Del. Du.), presumably for the sake of emphasizing כל; and that will justify the same construction being adopted here. In 2 S. 1[9], however, 𝔊[B, A] express כי כל נפשי בי, while 𝔊[L] expresses ועוד נ' בי: so it is possible (Klost. Bu.) that 𝔐 there has a "conflate" reading: in this case the parallel for the construction here disappears. It would, no doubt, be easy to read עוד כל for כל עוד, but it would be venturesome to do this in two passages (here and 2 S. 1[9]). [The alternative rendering adopted by] older commentators, AV. Schl. Me. RVm., and lately by Bu., is *all the while that* (lit. *all the duration of* . . . עוד being, of course, really a subst.) *my breath* (*is*) *in me*; כי will in this case introduce—as often after an oath (*Lex.* 472*a*, c)—the fact sworn to, followed by אִם = *not*, as 1 S. 25[34], 2 S. 3[35]. .[Yet] as Del. remarks, usage does not support this construction of כל עוד (as if it were similar to Arab. *kullamâ* = *as often as*).

4. יהגה] rd. תֶּהְגֶּה, after the fem. לשׁני, with 10 MSS; cf. G–K. 145*u*.

5. אם] after חלילה (as 1 S. 24[7], 2 S. 20[20]) = *not* (*Lex.* 50*b*). Lit. *Ad profanum sit! Surely* I will *not* justify you! EVV. "that" for אם is, of course, a paraphrase.

ממני] 1 MS 𝔊 omit; and so (*m. c.*) Bi. Du.; but it gives a more forcible ending to the line, [and if retained the verse has the rhythm 4 : 4, which is unusual, but not unparalleled, in Job (21[28] n.). 𝔖 omits אם אצדיק אתכם: this would leave the far more unusual rhythm 2 : 2 : 2 (17[1] n.)].

6. ולא ארפה] Ca. 3[4] אחזתיו ולא ארפנו; Pr. 4[13] הַחֲזֵק במוסר אַל־תֶּרֶף.

יֶחֱרַף] the Qal elsewhere only in the ptcp. (cf. דֹּבֵר, לְעֵי; hence Bu. St. יְחָרֵף; see also next n.

מימי] (*any*) *of my days*: the מן is partitive, as Dt. 16[4], 1 K. 18[5] (*Lex.* 580*b*, bottom; G–K. 119*w*, n.). מִיָּמָיו, מִיָּמֶיךָ, elsewhere = *since thy* (*his*) *birth* (38[12], 1 S. 25[28], 1 K. 1[6]); but יחרף requires an obj. Du. יֶחְפַּר is not abashed on account of my days; [Ehrlich: לא יֶרֶף לבבי מִתֻּמּוֹ, giving the vb. the same sense as in [a]: the desire to improve the parallelism and style is laudable; the result, unhappy].

8. יִבְצָע] the Qal is elsewhere always [and was here also doubtless intended by 𝔐 to be] associated with בֶּצַע, *unjust gain* [cf. 𝔗 יכנוש ממון בשקר; cf. 𝔖𝔙]: it is the Pi. which means to *cut off, finish* (6[9], Is. 10[12] 38[12] al.): and so it is better to point יְבַצַּע (Bi. Bu. al.) or יְבֻצַּע (Bu. alt.). [Possibly כי יבצע is a gloss (Be. Ehrlich): the postponement of the expressed subj. to [b] in 𝔐 is awkward: so also is the repetition of כי thrice in a single distich.]

יֵשֶׁל] from שָׁלָה, only here in the sense *draw out* (cf. ܫܠܐ, Ex. 2[10], Ps. 18[17] for מָשָׁה; שְׁלִי in 𝔗[J] Lev. 11[17] and Talm. (*v.* Levy), of *drawing* a fish, etc., out of the water), viz. from the body; but the ellipse is considerable, and the juss. remains unexplained (though Di. compares Ex. 22[4] כִּי יַבְעֶר־אִישׁ). Di. יָשֹׁל from שָׁלַל, Ru. 2[16] † (to *pull* or *draw out* from the sheaves); cf. Arab. *shalla*, to *draw out*, especially a sword from its scabbard. Schnurrer, Wellh. Wr. Sgf. Bu. Du. Be. יִשְׁאַל, *requireth*; cf. Lk. 12[20] τὴν ψυχήν σου ἀπαιτοῦσιν ἀπὸ σοῦ; and שאל נפש פ׳ (with a *human* subj.), 21[30], 1 K. 3[11]. Perles כי ישא לאלוה נפשו (Ps. 24[4]; נשא אל, Dt. 24[15], Ps. 25[1] 86[4] al.), yielding a good sense

in itself, but not harmonizing with כי יבצע, or agreeing well with מה תקות חנף.

10. [יקרא] Ehrlich, יקרב with אל־אלוה for אלוה—a good parallel to ª.]

אלוה] rd. either with 9 MSS אֶל־אלוה, or with 𝔊 אֵלָיו.

בכל־עת] 𝔊 *εἰσακούσεται αὐτοῦ*; = הֲיֵעָתֶר־לוֹ (Be.[K]) *will he let himself be entreated* (2 S. 21^{14} al.) *for him?* which, "as בכל־עת is somewhat otiose, may come into consideration" for the text (Bu., though he does not adopt it in his translation).

11. אורה אתכם ביד־אל] ב׳ after הוֹרָה, as Ps. $25^{8.12}$, Pr. 4^{11} al. 𝔊 *ἀλλὰ δὴ ἀναγγελῶ ὑμῖν τί ἐστιν ἐν χειρὶ κυρίου*, whence Be.[K] אוֹרֶה אֹתְךָ מַה־בְּיַד־אֵל (which would agree with the view that the line forms part of Ṣophar's speech); but (Bu.) *ὑμῖν* shows that 𝔊 certainly read אֶתְכֶם, *τί ἐστιν κτλ.*, though it *might* express מַה בְּיַד־אֵל, being not necessarily more than a paraphrase of ביד־אל. [Moreover, for אורה אתך the author would rather have written אורך (cf. 12^7: also with 1st p. suf. 6^{24}); but for א׳ אתכם rather than אורכם, cf. G–K. 58*a*, n. Du.'s אורך את אשר avoids this objection.]

עם] See on 23^{14}.

12. הבל תהבלו] cogn. acc. (G–K. 113*w*, end); cf. 1 S. 1^6, Is. 21^7 $22^{17f.}$ 24^{16}. [For the vb. cf.] Jer. 2^5, 2 K. 17^{15} (of practising idolatry). הֶבֶל is properly *a breath* (Is. 57^{13} וְאֶת־כֻּלָּם יִשָּׂא רוּחַ יִקַּח הָבֶל: Syr. ܗܒܠܐ, a *vapour*; Ps. 62^{11} Σ *μὴ γίνεσθε ἄτμις* for בְּגָזֵל אַל תֶּהְבָּלוּ), then, generally, of anything *unsubstantial* or *empty*: הָבַל is thus properly *to act emptily* (Jer. 23^{16}, Hif., of filling with vain hopes). But see Bu. [who in his commentary, withdrawing his earlier adhesion to the view that הבל meant *to speak emptily*, and here, therefore, virtually *to lie*, hesitates between giving to הבל the meaning *to cherish false hopes, or expectations* (cf. the Hif. in Jer. 23^{16}), which is suggested especially by Ps. 62^{11} (הבל ‖ בטח), and, perhaps, satisfies the context in Jer. 2^5, 2 K. 17^{15}, and the meaning *to come to nothing, to be destroyed*—the meaning (*der Nichtigkeit verfallen*) given by Giesebrecht for Jer. 2^5].

13. עם] either (Di.) as ¹¹ᵇ = in his mind and purpose, or (Hi. De.) = (laid up) with him (cf. Dt. 32^{34}). 𝔊 *παρὰ* K. = מֵאֵל

(cf. 20[29a]); so Altschüller (*ZAW*, 1886, p. 212; ע dittographed in 𝔐).

עריצים . . . יקחו] v.[14ff.] have the sg. (as [13a]); hence Du. Bu. Be.[K] עריץ . . . יקח (ם dittographed, and יקח changed to יקחו to agree with it). However [the sing. and pl. interchange in parallelism in 16[11]], 𝔊 expresses עריצים, and v.[14ff.] may quite naturally refer to [13a] אדם רשע. The case for the sg. is not so strong as in Is. 5[23b] (𝔊 צדיק; and 𝔐 ממנו). [V.[13] at present 4 : 4 (the first stichos being without a cæsura): without affecting the sense it could be reduced to 3 : 3 by omitting אדם and (cf. 20[29]) יקחו.]

14a. Cf. Ps. 92[8] [where (Bi.) כמו עשב is the apodosis, as is למו חרב here.]

לְמוֹ] 29[21] 38[40] 40[4] †. See *Lex.* מו (555*b*). [למו is always toneless, except, apparently, in 29[21], and in 33[22], if למו מתים is read there.]

15. יִקָּבֵרוּ] Ol. Me. Sgf. Be. prefix לא; but the change is violent, and why should לא have been omitted? [The sense would be the same as in 𝔐 (but more simply and, also, perhaps less powerfully expressed), if in 𝔐 בְּ is instrumental (*Lex.* 89*b*), and יִקָּבֵר ב a striking extension of the common idiom מות ב (*e.g.* Jer. 21[9]). To render 𝔐, *they shall be buried in* (*the time of*) *pestilence*, would be very weak.]

ואלמנתיו] the sg. sf., though not impossible (for it might refer to an individual among the שרידים: G–K. 145*m*), is nevertheless here harsh, and might easily be an error due to the singulars preceding. ואלמנֹתָם (Bi. Bu. Du. Be.[K]) is certainly better, though 𝔊 *αὐτῶν* is not decisive as to the translator's *reading*.

16. [מלבוש] 𝔊 *χρυσίον*; but 𝔐 is supported by ילבש in [17a] which 𝔊 is obliged to paraphrase (*περιποιήσονται*).]

18. כָּעָשׁ] *ὥσπερ σῆτες καὶ ὥσπερ ἀράχνη*, 𝔖 *as a spider* = כְּעַכָּבִישׁ (8[14]), evidently right (Me. Hi. Bu. Du. etc.): the existing text of 𝔊 has the original rendering and the correction (= 𝔐) side by side. [Ehrlich retains עש, giving it here as also in 4[19], Ps. 39[12] the meaning (*empty*) *bird's nest*, עֵשׁ (not עָשׁ as 𝔐) being the same word as عشّ, *bird's nest.*]

19. [עָשִׁיר] acc. of the state placed first as the emphatic word (1^{21} n.). Since *rich*, not *lie down*, is the emphatic idea, the phrases ולא יוסף (see next n.) and איננו should refer to it: *he shall no more* (be rich); *he is not* (rich).]

ולא יֵאָסֵף] and *is not gathered* (viz. for decent burial; cf. Jer. 8^{2}, Ezk. 29^{5} לא תֵאָסֵף ולא תקבץ). But this anticipates [b]: rd. with 𝔊 (*καὶ οὐ προσθήσει*), 𝔖 (ܘܠܐ ܢܘܣܦ), Ew. Di. Del. etc., ולא יוֹסִף, miswritten ולא יאסִף (as Ex. 5^{7} ולא תאסִפוּן, 1 S. 18^{29}; G–K. 68*b*). [Rhythmically also ולא־יוסיף as a single stress is preferable to ולא־יֵאָסֵף. 𝔗 = 𝔐: 𝔙 (Dives, cum dormieret, nihil secum auferet) = יֶאֱסֹף.]

20. תשיגהו] the fem. sg. by G–K. 145*k*: 14^{19} 20^{11} etc.

כמים] "too weak to describe the suddenness of an inundation, for which שֶׁטֶף, for instance, would have been available" (Bu.); the ‖ [b] also has לילה (Me.). Hence Me. Grä. בַּיּוֹם; Wr. St. Bu. יוֹמָם; Be. either. But 𝔊 (ὥσπερ ὕδωρ), 𝔖𝔗𝔙 = 𝔐; and it is a matter of taste whether or not כמים would be strong enough. מים suggests sometimes considerable force (2 S. 5^{20}, Is. 28^{17}, Am. 5^{24}, Hos. 5^{10}). Du. retains 𝔐, remarking that in [b] "לילה is only added because, while he is asleep, a man and his house together may be more readily overwhelmed by a storm."

21. וילך] G–K. 29*q*.

וישׂערהו] cf. Ps. 58^{10} יִשְׂעָרֶנּוּ, Hos. 13^{3} כְּמֹץ יְסֹעַר מִגֹּרֶן.

22. וישלך] rd. וישלך: see on 13^{27} 18^{12}. The subj. *God* is understood naturally by the reader: see on 3^{20}. Wr. Grimme עָלָיו; but without עליו the sentence is weak.

ברוח יברח] the inf. abs. "emphasizes the flight as hasty and inevitable" (Di.).

23. 𝔊 *κροτήσει ἐπ' αὐτοῦ χεῖρας αὐτῶν, Καὶ συριεῖ αὐτὸν ἐκ τοῦ τόπου αὐτοῦ*. עלימו is more easily explained as an error for עליו due to the following כפימו than as a poetical form for עליו (see on 20^{23}). ישפק . . . כפימו (sg. and pl. in *one and the same* clause) is very harsh, in spite of 𝔊 so reading, and should no doubt be corrected (cf. Hos. 4^{8}, Ps. 5^{10} 62^{5} etc.; and see Dr. on 2 S. 24^{13}): ישפקו עליו כפימו וישרקו is a great improvement. It is, however, a question whether, in the autographs of the OT.,

in cases like this, the pl. was always *written*, though it was intended to be *read*: see the instances collected in Dr. *Sam.* lxiii f. (^{2}lxii–lxiv); if this were the case, ישפקו and ישרקו for ישפק and ישרק will not be a real change of text, any more than יקום is for יקם. שפק as ישפיקו (in a different application), Is. 2^{6}†; elsewhere ספק (34^{37} al.); cf. on 5^{2}. [Bu. notes the similarity of ^{23b} וישרק עליו ממקמו to ^{21b} וישערהו ממקמו, and also (though the resemblance in this case is slighter) of ^{22a} וישלך עליו ולא יחמל and ^{23a} ישפק עלימו כפימו, and omits ^{21b} and ^{22a} and also $^{21a.\ 22b}$. It may be admitted that the sing. referring to God unnamed in ^{22} followed by the sing. referring to men unnamed in ^{23} is awkward; but this awkwardness disappears if ^{23} was intended to be read in the pl. (see above). If the description seems over full it might be better to omit $^{20a.\ 21b}$: then $^{20b.\ 21a}$ would form an admirable distich carrying on in detail the description of the night of the wicked man's doom; and followed by distichs referring to the treatment of him by God ^{22} and man ^{23}.]

CHAPTER XXVIII.

1. כִּי] [In view of the relation of the exact meaning of כי here to the criticism of cc. 27 and 28, it is to be regretted that the note which, as the space left in the MS indicates, Dr. had intended to write was never written. Moreover, in his corrected copy of RV. neither the text *surely* nor the mrg. *for* is deleted. In a note on 28^1 in *The Book of Job* he wrote, "*for* is the natural meaning of the Hebr. word: the text [of RV.] has *surely*, because in the present context of the chapter nothing has preceded, the reason for which can be contained in the verses which now follow." In his commentaries on, or translations of, Ex. 18^{11}, Am. 3^7, Jer. 31^{19}, Ps. 76^{11} he substituted *for* for the *yea* or *surely* of EV. In *Lex.* (p. 472*b*) he wrote: "there seem also [*i.e.* in addition to cases in which כי is added to advs. and interjections "to add force or distinctness to the affirmation which follows," see n. on 6^{22} 8^6] to be other cases in which כי, standing alone, has an intensive force, introducing a statement with emph., *yea*, *surely*, *certainly*; but it is doubtful whether כי has this force in all the passages for which scholars have had recourse to it, and whether in some it is not simply =*for*." In addition to the passages cited above in which Dr. elsewhere expressed his preference for *for*, some have given to כי an asseverative force in Nu. 23^{23}, 1 S. 17^{25} 20^{26}, 2 K. 23^{22}, Is. 32^{13}, Jer. 22^{22} (where כי might easily be a dittograph)].

לכסף] before מוצא, for emphasis.

מוצא] *place of coming forth* (𝔊 τόπος ὅθεν γίνεται): here, =*mine*. Elsewhere we have מוצא מים, 2 K. 2^{21} al.; מוצא דֶשֶׁא, c. 38^{27}.

2. ואבן יֻצוק נחושה] *And one melteth* (G-K. 144*d*) *stone* (=stone is melted) *into bronze*. נחושה, acc. of product (of course, not to be taken literally); cf. "Gn. 31^{45}, Lv. 6^8 (אשר),

1 K. 18[32]" (Hi.); and on 22[16]. יָצוּק from צוק = יָצַק, as 29[6], Is. 26[16] צָקוּן (corrupt) †; cf. מְצֻקֵי, 1 S. 2[8] † (מְצוּק, 1 S. 14[5] dittogr.); the 3 sg., as [3-4. 9-11] (Di.). A √ צוק, however, depends only on the punctuation: rd. probably (Hfm. Sta.) יֻצַק (from יָצַק, as Gn. 28[18] al.; G–K. 71); so also Du. Be.[K] (with יֻקַּח in [a]). Bu. יָצוּקוּ or יֻצְקוּ, or better יִצֹּק, originally יֻצַּק (so Be.[T]), to agree with יֻקַּח.

3. [חוקר . . . שם] the second vb. necessarily, if 𝔐 is correct, and, therefore, most naturally the first vb. also, are participles describing, by a usage, rare and chiefly late in Biblical Hebrew (Dr. § 135 (1) Obs.), a fact liable to *recur*—here, viz., what happens in every mine that is opened. But the pf., as in [4. 9–11], would be more normal: hence Du. Be.[K] חָקַר. The subj. of שם is indef., as is occasionally the case when the predicate is a part. (Dr. § 135 (6)); but it is curious that in [b] הוא should refer to the unnamed subj. of [a]: hence some omit הוא (Be.[K]? Du.), others insert אדם (Bu.), or אנוש (Bi.) after שם. Rhythmically [b] would be improved by the omission, [a] by the insertion; the two consecutive monosyllabic feet at the beginning of [a] give a rhythmical effect that is, at least, exceedingly unusual (cf. 26[10] 𝔐; but read חקק). On the other hand, had the writer wished to express the subj. אדם or אנוש, he would have been likely to do so in v.[2], if he had not already done so in a previous v., now lost. Sgf. reduces the v. from a tristich to a distich by omitting [c], with its striking phrasing, altogether; if tristichs were never used by the author, Du. would be more on right lines in obtaining a distich by emending קץ שם into a single vb. (בקש; but ?), omitting הוא, and also (with two Hebr. MSS) the ו of ולכל. [c], but also [a], was absent from 𝔊: see Be.[T]. Richter for הוא . . . לְחשך proposes לְחשך היכלי תהום—a very strange phrase and a harsh rhythm.]

קץ] the emphatic word in the sentence.

תכלית] 11[7] 26[10].

[4. Another tristich, if 𝔐 is correct; in this case מני רגל must be taken with הנשכחים, and this yields a very strange phrase, though it has commonly been accepted without demur. Further (1) הנשכחים מני־רגל, though a possible, is not a very

probable three-stressed line; (2) מני־רגל דלו and מאנוש נעו look like parallel expressions: yet as such they would produce 2 : 2 rhythm, which is very rare in Job (19[14] n.). Possibly, then, מאנוש is a gloss on מני רגל, and נעו on דלו, which is used here in a rare sense. If the last two words be omitted, a rhythmically good distich 3 : 3 is left. But strange, if not questionable usages, remain. Nowhere else does נחל mean *a shaft*, the meaning adopted by most recent scholars, nor a *gallery* of a mine (Siegfr.-Sta.); nor has פרץ elsewhere quite the force it must have here, if נחל means shaft; nor is מעם elsewhere used to express *away from*, *far from*, for which מן is commonly used, as in מאנוש in ° (see, further, *Lex.* 578*a*, bot.): *Lex* (769[a]) cites only this passage for מעם = *away from*, adding "si vera l." Unusual also, and indeed in Hebrew unique, is the meaning of דלו, *to hang*, *dangle* (here presumably on the rope by which the miner is let down the shaft); commonly דלל in Hebrew means *to languish*, *be weak* or *poor* (hence AV. RVm. here, *they are minished*), and the adj. דל, *weak*, *poor*; and دلّ in Arabic commonly means *to direct aright*, *guide*: but the root must at an early stage of its history have developed as a third principal meaning *to waver*, *hang down*, *dangle*, for traces of this meaning survive in several languages: in Hebrew in addition to דלו here, if the v. refers to a miner's mode of descent, cf. דַּלָּה, *thrum*, *i.e.* threads of warp *hanging* from the loom (Is. 38[12]), or *hair*, as that which *hangs* from the head (Ca. 7[6]); in Eth. cf. ድልል : *hanging* locks of hair; in Arabic دلدل means *to put in motion a thing suspended*; تدلدل, *to move about hanging down*, *to dangle* and then *to vacillate*, as in تدلدلوا بين امرين فلم يستقيموا, *they vacillated between two affairs and did not favour the right course* (Lane, 901*a*), and the adj. دلدّل is used similarly (*ib.* 902*a*). Grä. may be right in eliminating the strange מעם גר by redividing [illegible] into נְחָלִם עַם גָּר (see below): then הנשכחים is (or something of which it is the corruption was) the synonymous parallel to עם־גר, the form of parallelism (down to דלו) being then of the type described in *Forms of Hebrew Poetry*, p. 67 f. If מעם גר אוֹר (see below), or rhythmically better מעם־אור (but not מעם נֵר, which Peake is inclined to adopt from

Ley, for this would mean not *away from the light*, but very unsuitably *away from the lamp*), were read for מעם־נר, parallelism of the same type could be attained by reading בחשך for הנשכחים of which the נ was perhaps not read by 𝔊 (see below), and the ם(י) may have arisen from the מ of מני. The strangeness and difficulties of the verse are only partially and very hazardously met by the suggestions that רגל here has the meaning of the Arabic رجل, *men* (Ehrlich), that מאנוש has the same force as in Is. 52[14] (*in no ordinary human manner they swing to and fro*, Hitz.), or that v.[4c] is the direct acc. of פרץ, *they break through the stones of darkness* (and so obtain) *a shaft* (Honth.). Marshall, pointing נֵר, renders *the stream burst in from the lime-stone*, keeping nearer to the normal use of נחל, but obtaining the idea, also rather curiously expressed, of the flooding of a mine, which is out of harmony with v.[11] and also with the leading thought of the passage—man's skill; cf. Peake.]

מעם גָר] "from the sojourner" cannot be right. EVV. "from *where* men sojourn" is an illegitimate paraphrase. 𝔊 (Θ) (ἀπὸ) κονίας (= נִר: Drus. Field, Di.; cf. Dn. 5[5], and 𝔊 Dt. 27[2], Am. 2[1]); so also 'ΑΣ [Sgf. בֶּעָפָר]. Bi.[1], neatly and admirably, מֵעַם־נֵר אור: so Bu.; Be.[K] מֵרְגָבִים (21[33]), poor. Grä. ingeniously נְחָלִם עַם־גֵר, a sojourning people (foreign miners) break open shafts.

הנשכחים מני] "*they that are forgotten by* (24[1]: or *away from*) *the foot* (*sc.* that passeth over),"—a closer definition of the subj. of פרץ, just as 30[3], Ps. 18[33] 19[11] 49[7], with change from sg. to pl.: RV. "*they are* forgotten . . ." (= נשכחו) is an impossible rendering of 'הנ.

דלו מאנוש נָעו] the accents connect דלו מאנוש: see 6b 32[8b]. 𝔊 οἱ δὲ ἐπιλανθανόμενοι ὁδὸν δικαίαν (= הַשֹּׁכְחִים מַעְגָּל, with δικαίαν added, as Ps. 2[11]) ἠσθένησαν ἐκ βροτῶν makes the v. teach an excellent moral truth, unfortunately, however, wholly alien to the context.

5. תחתיה] syntactically "an accus., dependent on the impersonal passive נהפך" (Hi.): see G–K. 121*a*, *b*; and cf. on 20[26].

כמו אש] = as by fire: G-K. 118*w*. [𝔙 *igni* = במו: so Hrz. Schl. Me.; the reference would then be to blasting.]

6. ועפרת זהב לו] (1) Schl. Del. Stud. EVV. "and it (the place) hath dust of gold," where sapphires are found there is also auriferous dust—a somewhat nugatory statement; (2) Hrz. Hi. Bu. Du. "and it (the sapphire) hath dust of gold"—the ספיר being not our "sapphire," which was "almost unknown before Roman imperial times," but the opaque blue *lapis lazuli*, which, as the "sapphire" of the ancients, is described by Theophrastus (*De Lap.* c. iv.) and Pliny (*HN* $37^{38f.}$) as sprinkled with gold dust (*ὥσπερ χρυσόπαστος*, *inest ei et aureus pulvis*, and *aurum* in sapphiro scintillat), with allusion to the particles of iron pyrites, easily mistaken by their colour and lustre for gold, frequently found in it (cf. Sapphire, in *DB* and *EB*); (3) Schult. Ew. Hi. RVm., "and he (the miner) getteth dust of gold." (2) is most probable: the particles glittering yellow in the dark blue stone would be a point which the poet might well refer to. Oo. וַעֲפָרָהּ זהב לו, and *its dust* is gold to him (so Be.^{K}, but without לו), which might be right: Bu. inclines to it.

7. נתיב] *cas. pendens*, as 17^{15b} 29^{16} n.

שזפתּ] 20^{9}; Ca. 1^{6} †.

8. הדריך] the Hif. (intrans.), as Jg. 20^{43}, Jer. 51^{33}.

בני שחץ] 41^{26} †, poet. for *proud beasts*: שחץ also only here and 41^{26}. The √ in Eth. (Di. 234) is to *be insolent* (Arab. شخص also is to *rise* (of a star), *rise up*, *be elevated* (Lane, 1516); but ? ش = שׁ [*JQR* xv. 708 ff.]): in NH. שָׁחַץ, Pi. Hithp. (with derivv. שָׁחָץ, שַׁחַץ, שַׁחֲצִית, שַׁחְצָן) is to *be proud*, *boastful*. Cf. Ḳi. ובדברי רבותינו ז״ל גם כן (שַׁבָּת סב, סוֹף ע״ב) אנשי ירושלים אנשי שַׁחַץ היו, כלומר אנשי גַּאֲוָה וְגַסּוּת הָרוּחַ.

עדה] poet. for עָבַר. Common in Arab. and Aram. (in 𝔗 עֲדִי = Heb. עָבַר, as Gn. 15^{17} 𝔖, Jer. 9^{9} 𝔗). So in Hif. Pr. 25^{20} † מַעֲדֶה בגד (= מעביר, Jon. 3^{6}).

שחל] 4^{10}.

10. יארים] properly *Nile-canals* (Gn. $41^{1ff.}$ etc.), then more generally *water-channels*, Is. 33^{21} (𝔊 *διώρυχες*); here, still more

generally, horizontal *galleries* leading into the mine (Di. De. Bu. Du.). Cf. [4] נַחַל = *shaft*.

11. מִבְּכִי] מִן, as [Is. 7^8] and often [BDB 583*a*, *b*]. 𝔊 βάθη (? עִמְקֵי, or a guess, or a paraphrase of נִבְכֵי,—which, however, in 38^{16} is rendered πηγή) δὲ ποταμῶν ἀπεκάλυψεν (? חָפַשׂ, taken as = חָשַׂף, Is. 52^{10} 𝔊), 𝔙 profunda quoque fluviorum scrutatus est (= חִפֵּשׂ: so ʼΑΘ ἐξερεύνησεν), whence Wetzst. *ap.* Del., Hfm. Be. Bu. מַבְּכֵי (* מַבָּךְ = *place of* נְבָכִים *or springs = sources*). Grä. Perl. (p. 69), Be. (alt.) נִבְכֵי (38^{16} †; see n.), and חִפֵּשׂ (Grä. Perl. Be. St.; "has much for it," Bu.), *he searcheth out the sources of streams*. But what is the object (in this connection) of searching out the sources of *streams*? "The sources of streams he bindeth up" (to prevent the mine from being flooded) would be more to the purpose; but נהרות itself is the more natural obj. to חבש, as in 𝔐 (so Du.).

תַעֲלֻמָהּ] cf. תַעֲלֻמוֹת, 11^6, Ps. 44^{22} (ת' לֵב). The *mappik*, if correct, can be only for euphony (Ḳi. Michlol, 31*a*, 186*b* לתפארת הקריאה ולא לְכִנּוּי, cited by De.), as Is. 28^4, Ezk. 22^{24}, Zec. 4^2; but it is better simply to omit it.

12. תִּמָּצֵא] v.[20] תבוא; 𝔊 both here and in v.[20] εὑρέθη. Signs of assimilation occur in MSS of 𝔐: here [Ken. 150] reads תבא תמצא: in v.[20] [Ken. 76] reads תמצא. It is possible that תמצא here (cf. תמצא, v.[13]) was substituted for תבא; on the other hand, מאין is not conclusive against תמצא, for cf. נמצא with מן in Hos. 14^9. [Ken. 157] reads here תצא, in which, if the textual support were stronger, it would be tempting to see an original verbal parallelism to v.[1]—But whence does Wisdom come forth, *i.e.* from what source (מוצא) is it drawn? cf. מקום in [b] with מקום in [1b].]

13. עֶרְכָּהּ] Read with 𝔊 (ὁδὸν αὐτῆς) Di. Hi. Bu. etc. דַּרְכָּהּ (cf. [23a]): the price would be suitable in vv.[15–19], but is here out of place.

14. אָמַר] תהום is usually fem., but msc. here, Jon. 2^6, Hab. 3^{10}, Ps. 42^8: אמרה (Du. ("perhaps"), Be.[K]) is thus not in itself necessary, though it makes a variation from [b] אמר.

15. סְגוֹר] = זָהָב סָגוּר (1 K. $6^{20.21}$ $7^{49.50}$ (= 1 Ch. $4^{20.22}$), 10^{21} = 2 Ch. 9^{20} †), even if (Hfm. Du. Be.[K] St.; Bu. "perhaps")

סָגוּר is not to be read as an abbreviation for זָהָב סָגוּר, like אופיר (22^{24}) for כתם אופיר. The derivation of סגור is uncertain: perhaps, *shut up*, and so prized, rare: cf. Ass. *ḫurâṣu* (= חָרוּץ) *sakru* (Del. *HWB* 499*b* "verriegelt, verschlossen").

16. [תְסֻלֶּה] 19 †; cf. (with א) La. 4^2 † בני ציון הַיְקָרִים הַמְסֻלָּאִים בַּפָּז.

17. [יערכנה] ערך intrans.; will not *rank*, *compare* with it, or *equal* it; so 19: cf. Ps. 89^7 כי מי בשחק יערך ליהוה; and, actively, Is. 40^{18} מה־דמות תערכו־לו (= παραβαλεῖτε αὐτῷ).

[זכוכית †] so Kit.: זְכוֹכִית, Ba. Gi., זכוכית also in NH. (Levy, i. 536*a*), and 𝔗² here; זגוגית in 𝔗³, Dt. 33^{19} 𝔗 Jer. מָנֵי זגוגיתא, and in Aram. generally (including Syr.). Aram. זגג is to be *clear*, *transparent* (*ChWB* i. 213*b*). Arab. *zajāj* is a loan-word from the Aram. (Fränkel, *Aram. Fremdwörter im Arab.* 64).

[ותמורתה וג׳] The לא governs both clauses: G-K. 152*z*.

[כְּלִי] 11 MSS, and, perhaps, ΘΣ𝔗^{1.2.3} 𝔙, כְּלֵי; but the collective כְּלִי (jewels in a mass) is more forcible than כְּלֵי (a number of individual jewels).

18. [גביש †] *crystal*; cf. אלגביש, *hail* (Ezk. $13^{11.13}$ 38^{22} †). Κρύσταλλος means similarly both *ice* and *crystal*.

[לא יִזָּכֵר] the constr. as 22^9 (G-K. 121*b*): ראמות וגביש are implicit accusatives.

[משך] מָשַׁךְ is to *draw* along, away, etc., *out of* a pit, Gn. 37^{28}, a fish out of water, Jb. 40^{25}: hence מֶשֶׁךְ, the *drawing up*—said perhaps (Boch. *Hieroz*. ii. 683, Di.) with allusion to pearls drawn up from the sea—fig. for *securing after effort* or *acquisition*: מן is short for מִמֶּשֶׁךְ, "Ps. 4^8, Is. 10^{10}, Pr. 16^{16a}" (Hi.); G-K. 133*e*. EVV. *price*, comes from Kimchi: ומשך החכמה יָקָר החכמה כי הדבר הַיָּקָר יִמָּשֵׁךְ שְׁמוֹ למרחוק וכן משך הזרע (Ps. 126^6) כי הַזֶּרַע יָקָר לְזוֹרְעוֹ ואף כי בארץ נגב, *i.e.* the fame of a precious thing is *drawn along*, or *extends*, far, and so משך means *preciousness*; and משך having this sense here, it has it also in Ps. 126^6 משך הזרע, meaning "*precious* seed" (AV. PBV.), because seed is precious to the sower, even in a dry land.

21. [[וְהַנַּעֲלָמָה]] om. וְ 𝔊𝔖𝔙; this is preferable, even if (Di. Bu.) 21 originally followed 14; note 14 and 22 both open without וְ.]

23. [הבין] 5 MSS 𝔊 (συνέστησεν) הֵכִין; but see [b].

24. [תחת כָּל־] 𝔊 τὴν ὑπ' οὐρανὸν πᾶσαν, 𝔙 et omnia quæ sub; whence Be.[K] כָּל תחת; but the change is unnecessary. Bu. rejects [24] as a gloss; Du. places it after [11] ("he" being then man). It is said, viz., that, in giving the reason for [23], it implies that Wisdom has a home upon earth known to God (*because* God sees everything under heaven, *therefore* He knows the way to her), whereas that she can be found at all upon earth is denied in [12f. 21f.]: vv.[25–27] further state clearly that God knew Wisdom at the time He was engaged in the work of *creation*, how then can His knowledge of her abode be said ([24] כי) to depend on His knowing everything in the existing *created* world? Logically, the objection is sound; but is it sound poetically? Does it not press the language unduly? [cf. Peake]. V.[24] is a poetical statement of God's omniscience: it is couched certainly in terms which are strictly inconsistent with the teaching of [12f. 21f. 23. 25–27]; but the underlying thought which these terms are intended to express, viz. that God is omniscient, and has always known Wisdom, is perfectly consistent with it.

25. [לעשות] rd. either (Bu.) בַּעֲשׂתוֹ or (𝔖 ܟܕ ܥܒܕ; 𝔙 qui vidit; 𝔊, apparently connecting with [24a], and having this after [24b] εἰδὼς δὲ τὰ ἐν τῇ γῇ πάντα ἐποίησεν) הֶעָשָׂה (so Du., connecting with [23]): in either case the pf. in ומים תִּכֵּן is normal (G–K. [114*r*] or [Dr. § 147, cf. §§ 117, 118]); but the former, making [25] ‖ to [26] and giving a double protasis for [27], with its emphatic אז, alters 𝔐 least, and yields the most forcible climax to the argument. Ew. De. Di. etc. retain לַעֲשׂוֹת, connecting with [24], or (Hi. who regards [24] as a parenthesis) with [23]; לעשות being rendered either (Ew. Hi. Di.) *to make* (in [b] the constr. being then changed, as 5^{11b}: see *n.*), or (De.) *in making*. But [25] (alone) halts after either [23] or [24], whereas, as ‖ to [26], it is forcible.

[תִּכֵּן] to *regulate, give* תֹּכֶן (Ex. 5^{18}) *the right measure to*, as Ps. 75^{4}, and especially Is. 40^{12} מי מָדַד בשׁעלו מים (cf. מִדָּה here) ושׁמים בַּזֶּרֶת תִּכֵּן, [13] מי־תִכֵּן את־רוח יהוה.

26. [וחזיז] 38^{25b} (= [26b] here), Zec. 10^{1} עֹשֶׂה חזיזים ^ †: *forked*

flashes; Ar. *ḥassa*, to *cut* or *notch*. On NH. and Aram. חזיז, *shining clouds* (Ca. 2^6 𝕿 רְכֵב על חזיזא קלילא), see *NHWB* and *ChWB*, *s.v.*

27. [ויספרה] and *recounted it*,—expressed Wisdom's qualities, and so gave evidence that He knew all about her not to man (who did not then exist), but in the abstract, in general. Ew. Di.[1] De.[2] (after Schult. *eius numeros, rationes, summas summarum recensuit*): *And counted it* (סִפֵּר as 38^{37}; or (Be. alt. וַיִּסְפְּרָהּ), seems hardly (Di.[2]) compatible with a singular object. [Du. also reads the Kal, but with the suggestion that it is here used as a denominative of סופר, with the meaning *studied*: to חקר he also gives an unusual sense—to put to the proof: such unusual and unsupported usages may be technical uses of the school of the wise men, and our insufficient knowledge of this language may account for the difficulty of seizing exactly and with certainty the meaning of the v. (see exegetical n.).]

[הכינה] 5 MSS הבינה: 𝕾 ܐܟܠܗ = הכילה.]

28. [לאדם] MS $^{Ken. 378}$ om. Commonly rendered *to men*: Ehrlich, *concerning*, *with reference to*, *man*; but Gn. 20^{13}, Dt. 33^9, Jg. 9^{54}, Ps. 3^8 71^{10} are not quite similar, and in any case would lead us to expect חכמתו and בינתו in what follows.]

[הן] MS $^{Ken. 76}$ 𝕾 om.]

אדני] only here in Job; and elsewhere, in the mouth of God, only Ezk. 13^9 23^{49} 24^{24} 28^{24} (Di.; each time כי אני אדני יהוה: Cornill's excision of אדני is arbitrary). Some 100 MSS read יהוה, and יראת יהוה is what would be naturally expected: but the author eschews יהוה as far as possible (cf. on 12^9); so he may easily have said יראת אדני for it [, though in 6^{14} the phrase is יראת שדי].

CHAPTER XXIX.

2. כירחי] = as *in*, etc., as regularly (Is. 51^{9} etc.; G–K. 118*s*, *u*).

כימי וג׳] a good example of a c. st. before a rel. cl. (G–K. 130*d*): cf. Ps. 65^{5} אַשְׁרֵי תִּבְחַר וּתְקָרֵב, Pr. 8^{32} וְאַשְׁרֵי דְּרָכַי יִשְׁמֹרוּ.

3. בְּהִלּוֹ] if correct, from an inf. חַל (like שַׁךְ, Jer. 5^{26}; שְׁכַב, G–K. 67*p*), with sf. (like בְּשִׁכְבָהּ), anticipating the gen. (like בְּבֹאוֹ האיש, Ezk. 10^{3}; G–K. 131*n*; Dr. on 1 S. 21^{14}). But the construction is very inelegant: rd. the Hif. (𝕿 בְּאַנְהָרוּתֵיהּ) בַּהֲהִלּוֹ (Ol. Bu.), or (Du.) בְּהִלּוֹ, with elision of ה, as in לַשְׁמִיד, Is. 23^{11} (G–K. 53*q*).

לאורו] the ל of norm.; *Lex.* 516*a*.

חשך] acc. after הלך, as Is. 50^{10}, Mic. 2^{11}, Pr. 6^{12}; sq. את, Dt. 1^{19} 2^{7}.

4. חרפי], חֹרֶף, *autumn*, properly, it seems, the time of *plucking* (fruits), from * חָרַף = Arab. *kharafa*, *carpere* (Fleischer in *ChWB* i. 426*a*): here fig. not of youth, but of the age of *ripe manhood* (Schult. *aetas virilis suis fructibus foeta et exuberans*), which Job was enjoying before his calamities fell upon him. Bu. argues that, being opposed to קיץ and including winter (Gn. 8^{22}, Ps. 74^{17}, Pr. 20^{4}, Zec. 14^{8}; cf. the denom. vb. Is. 18^{6}), it can bear only an unfavourable sense, so he would read, with Königsb. Volz., פִּרְחִי, *my blossoming*, *flourishing* (cf. fig. of men, Ps. 92^{13}, Pr. 11^{28} al.); but it is not certain that this is the case.

[Ehrlich חַרְפִּי, assuming a Heb. חרף, حَرْف, *extremity* (of a mountain, its) *summit*; the phrase would then mean: the days when I reached the summit of my fortunes.]

בסוד] for בהיות סוד. סוד, properly (cf. ܣܘܼܕ) ὁμιλία, *friendly* or *confidential discourse* (Ps. 55^{15}), and then *friendship* (Ps. 25^{14} RVm., Pr. 3^{32} RVm.). But 𝕲 (ὅτε . . . ἐπισκοπὴν

ἐποιεῖτο; cp. La. 3[44] 𝔊, Be.), Σ (ὁπότε περιέφρασσεν), 𝔖 (ܘܣܘܢ ܡܠܝܢ ܟܕ), point to בְּסֹךְ (from סכך); cf. סכך על, to *cover*, 1 K. 8[7] al.; סַכּוֹתָה לְרֹאשִׁי, Ps. 140[8]: so Houb. Grä. (Pss. i. 129), Sgf. Buhl, Perl. 89, Bu. Du., probably rightly.

6. ברחץ] ר' intrans. = to *bathe oneself* (Ex. 2[5] al.).

הליכי] הָלִיךְ only here.

בחמה] חֵמָה for חֶמְאָה: cf. on נֻוֶה, 22[29].

וצור יצוק עמדי] Du. Be.[K] omit צור (as variant of יצוק), and read (Be.[K] with "perhaps") יָצוּק עֳמָדַי (עמדי as ‖ to הֲלִיכַי), and *my standing* poured out: יָצוּק may be right (see on 28[2]); but עֳמָדַי is highly improbable; a place, not an action such as standing, would pour forth oil. No change is needed [except for the reason that [b], containing four stresses at least, is overlong: עמדי might be an accidental repetition from v.[6]]: on צור (already in 𝔊), *v.s.*

7. בצאתי שער] יצא, sq. acc. is to *go out of* (Ex. 9[29. 33], Nu. 35[26]); cf. כל־יצאי שער עירו, Gn. 34[24]: the שער, though mostly used of the gate of a city, must then be here the gate of Job's house or estate (cf., of a private person's house, Pr. 14[19] שערי צדיק; or farm, Jg. 18[16. 17]); Jb. 31[34] פתח (Bu.), does not prove the contrary, for a שער is a פתח, and פתח השער often occurs: there is thus no occasion to alter the text.—𝔊 [for שער] ὄρθριος = שַׁחַר.

עֲלֵי [6[5] n.].

קרת] as Pr. 8[3] 9[3. 14] 11[11] † (cf. Ph. קרתחדשת, "*Newtown*," the name of a place in Cyprus (Cooke, *NSI* 52, 53), and = *Carthage*, *CIS* i. 269[5] (= *NSI* 49[5]), al.): elsewhere קִרְיָה.

אכין] the impf., attached ἀσυνδέτως (Dr. 163, *Obs.*; cf., after a finite vb., 1 S. 13[17] 18[5], Jer. 15[6]) to בצאתי, and *virtually* under the government of ב, "carries on the sentence in the form of a frequentative" (Bu.). וַהֲכִינוֹתִי, would be the normal constr. (Dr. 118; G–K. 114*r*).

8. וישישים] 15[10] n.

קמו עמדו] the *asyndeton* is idiomatic and effective: cf. Jer. 5[28] 9[9] נָדְדוּ הָלָכוּ (50[3]), 15[7] שכלתי אבדתי, 46[21], Is. 18[6] *end*, 46[2] 51[17] *end*.

9. עצרו ב׳] see on 4^2.

10. 𝔊 om.: 𝔊 ^{10a} being obviously a doublet of ^{11a}, and 𝔊 ^{10b} being really Θ.

נחבאו] pl. by attraction to נגידים; cf. 15^{20b} 21^{21b} 38^{21b}, Is. 60^5, Hi. (G–K. 146*a*),—though Ol. proposed to delete the ו. But *hidden* is a strange fig. to apply to קול, and נחבאו may well be due to a scribe's eye looking by error at ^{8a} (Me. Di. al.): rd. probably either נֶאֱלָם, *was dumb* (Sgf. Bu.), or נִכְלָא, *was restrained* (Du.).

11. כי] not *When* (AV.), but *For*: lit. for the ear heard, *and* called me happy = For *when* the ear heard, *it* called me happy (RV.): so ^{b} and the eye saw, *and* gave witness to me = and *when* the eye saw, *it*, etc.; and often similarly.

ותעידני] and *attested me*, as 1 K. $21^{10.13}$.

12. מְשַׁוֵּעַ] 𝔊 ἐκ χειρὸς δυναστοῦ (so Ps. 72^{12} for מְשַׁוֵּעַ): probably = מִשּׁוֹעַ misunderstood (in 9^{22} 𝔊 δυν. = רָשָׁע). MSS $^{715.847}$, De Rossi (*Supplem.* 121) מִשּׁוֹעַ, *a clamore* (Is. 22^5), and MSS $^{208.554}$ מִשׁוֹעַ (without dagesh).

ויתום ולא עֹזֵר לו] Ps. 72^{12} ועני ואין עֹזֵר לו. 11 MSS (De Rossi, *ibid.* 121 f.), 𝔊𝔖𝔙 לא.

14. וילבשני] Ges. *Thes.* quotes Ephr. ii. 504 ܫܐܕܐ ܠܒܫܟ, a demon has *put thee on*, or *clothed himself in thee*, fig. for filled thee (see further exx. in PS. 1887): cf. Arab. *malbūs*, *mad*.

משפטי] 𝔊 (κρίμα), 𝔙 Du. Be.^{K} Vo. משפט. But 𝔐 is more forcible.

15. לְעִוֵּר] G–K. 35*g*. So Ḳi. *Michlol.* 53*b* (Baer, 49).

16. ריב לא־ידעתי] = of (him whom) I knew not: cf. 18^{21} מקום לא ידע אל (G–K. 130*d*).

אחקרהו] Ps. 90^{17c}, Is. 9^1, Gn. 28^{13} etc.: Dr. 197.

17. מְתַלְּעוֹת] Jl. 1^6, Pr. 30^{14}†; מַלְתָּעוֹת, Ps. 58^7†.

18. עם קני אגוע וכחול ארבה ימים] [עם, *with*, as in Ex. 22^{24}, Lv. $25^{35f.39.47}$: *Lex. s.v.* עם, g. 2. In ^{b} the familiar figure of the sand to express multitude is recognized by 𝔖 and probably by 𝔗, but not by 𝔊, 𝔙]. 𝔊 ἡ ἡλικία μου γηράσει, ὥσπερ στέλεχος φοίνικος πολὺν χρόνον βιώσω; Σ ἔλεγον

δὲ μετὰ τῆς νοσσιᾶς μου γηράσειν; 𝔙 In nidulo meo moriar, et *sicut palma* multiplicabo dies; 𝔖 (with a double rend. of [a]) ܒܩܢܐ ܡܬܩܢܢܐ ܐܦܪܘܚ. ܘܐܝܟ ܩܢܝܐ[1] ܐܣܓܐ. ܘܐܝܟ ܚܠܐ ܢܣܓܘܢ ܝܘܡ̈ܝ ܕܚܝ̈ܝ; 𝔗 עם תוקפי בשרכפי איתנגיד (in my nest I shall depart) והיך חלא אסגי יומיא. 𝔊 [a] is obviously a paraphrase. Me. Bi. rd. קָנֶה after 𝔖 *with the reed*, *i.e.* with the aromatic reed, which has always had the reputation of being durable, and lasting long (not as Sgf. p. 44, understands it, *long-lived*, so that his objection, that the reed is cut down every year falls through). But the comparison is remote; and to express such an idea, some long-lived tree would have been more naturally thought of by the poet. In Sir. 50[12] *ὡς στελέχη φοινίκων* = Heb. [14] כערבי נחל,[2] *like poplars of the wâdy* (Jb. 40[22]); and this translation seems to show that a נַחַל = Arab. *nakhl*, *palm-tree* (whether or not it is rightly so rendered there) was known in Heb.: Perles (*JQR* xi., 1899, 688), *Lex.* 636*b* ("perhaps"), *EBi.* 3553, adopt this sense for Nu. 24[6] (for a reason against it, see Gray, *Numb.* 363); and *EBi. ib.*, Buhl, *HWB*, *s.v.* ("perhaps"), and Be.[K] would read כַּנַּחַל here for כחול. [A third interpretation of חול is *Phœnix* (in this meaning to be pointed חוֹל, according to the Massoretes of Nahardea). This interpretation is as old as the Talmud (Sanhedrin, 108*b*), and has been frequently adopted by modern commentators (Hitz. Ew. Del. Bu. Du. Peake). It can scarcely be rejected on the ground (Di., Ch. in *EBi.* 3765) that the fable could not have reached the Jews as early as the lifetime of the author of Job: Hesiod refers to the longevity of the bird (Fragm. 50, ed. Gaisf.), and Herod. (ii. 73) heard in Egypt both of its longevity and of the miraculous way in which it brought its father from Arabia and buried him in Heliopolis. The earliest direct Jewish reference is, it is true, in the Jewish tragedian Ezekiel (prob-

[1] Lee has ܩܢܝܢܐ; but Cod. Ambros., the Urmia ed. (1852), and Ephr. Syr. ii. 12 F, Barhebr. *Scholia in Job*, ed. Bernstein, 1858 (both cited by Merx, *Archiv*, ii. 105), have ܩܢܝܐ, which is evidently right.

[2] Reading prob. נִצְּבֵי. In 𝔊 *στέλεχος* may denote either *stem* (=גזע Jb. 14[8]) or *bough* (=עֲבֹת, Ezk. 19[11]; =פארה, Ezk. 31[12, 13]).

ably 2nd cent. B.C.), who, without naming it, refers to the great size and beautiful plumage of the bird seen at Elim in Arabia (Eus. *Præp. Ev.* ix. 29). The attempt, however, to claim the LXX as supporting the interpretation is very questionable: for that *στέλεχος φοίνικος* was a natural rendering of a single word understood by the translators to mean a palm-tree, is shown by the fact that תמרים is in Ex. 15^{27}, Nu. 33^{9} rendered *στελέχη φοινίκων*: there is, therefore, no ground for the conjecture (Hitz. Del. al.) that *στ. φοίνικος* has arisen from an original *φοῖνιξ* by a misunderstanding. In the later Jewish writings the miraculous bird is known either (Sanh. 108*b*) as אורשנא (אורשינה) or (Ber. R. § 18) חול (Aram. חלא). In Ber. R.[1] it is said of the animals that they all obeyed Eve, and accepted the fruit of the forbidden tree from her, חוץ מעוף אחד ושמו חול, except a bird whose name (as it was inferred from the present passage) was חול: this bird, it is added, lives 1000 years, at the end of which time a fire originating in its nest burns it, and only a piece of the size of an egg survives; but this puts forth pinions and the bird lives again. The reason given for the immortality of the אורשנה in Sanh. 108*b* is different: when Noah was feeding the beasts in the ark this bird alone, seeing how busily engaged Noah was, refrained from asking for food and so adding to his labours; thereupon Noah said יהא רעוא דלא תמות. Granted a familiarity, such as the Rabbis of the Midrash must have had, with the fable of the long-lived or immortal bird, it is easy to see how the context in this passage, with its allusion to the nest and length of days, might suggest that חול was a name of it; and by itself the assertion in the Midrash cited above has no more value than the demands of exegesis: if exegesis demands an allusion to the phœnix, חול, or some word corrupted into חול, was a name of it. Del., however, claims that חול, as the name of the phœnix, is independently supported by the fact that *ΑΛΛΩΗ*, *ΑΛΛΟΗ* are given in a Coptic-Arabic glossary as an equivalent of سمندل, a

[1] תם [in] גם לאישה] רבי האכילה את הבהמה ואת החיה ואת העופות הכל שמעו לה חוץ מעוף אחד ושמו חול הה"ד וכחול ארבה ימים רבי רבי ינאי אמרו אלף שנה הוא חי ובסוף אלף שנה אש יוצאה מקינו ושורפתו ומשייר בו כביצה וחוזר ומגדל אברים וחי. ר' יודן בר"ש אומר אלף שנה חי ולסוף אלף שנה גופו כלה וכנפיו מתמרטין. ומשתייר בו כביצה וחוזר וגו'.

name applicable to both the phœnix and the salamander. He inclines to see in חול a Hebraized form of this Egyptian word. The two chief exegetical considerations are these: (1) if עם קני אגוע is the original text in ^{a}, an allusion to the phœnix well accounts for death being referred to in the first line, length of days in the second: the phœnix, according to some forms of the fable, did actually multiply its days *after* it had died in its nest; but (2) an allusion to the resurrection and future life of the phœnix, and the attribution to Job of the wish that he might in this respect be like the phœnix, is inconsistent with the point of view throughout attributed to him: cf. esp. 14^{1-12}. Che. (*EBi.* 3765), discarding the view that the phœnix is referred to, not unnaturally suspects the text of ^{a} though his emendation בְּזִקְנִי for עם קני is rather weak; ct. the more forcible phrasing of 5^{26}, Gn. 15^{15}. N. Herz (*ZATW* xx. 162) suggests מִקְנִי for קני and בחיל for כחול. Preferable to either of these suggestions would be אֶזְקַן for אגוע (Sgf.). See further on the phœnix, Bochart, *Hierozoicon*, Lib. vi. cap. v.; the commentaries especially of Del. and Di. on this passage; and Lightfoot on Ep. Clem. xxv. In addition to ancient references already given, see iii. Baruch 6 f., and Secrets of Enoch 12, 14, where this fable is highly developed and elaborated.]

19 f. [Circumstantial clauses defining the condition or circumstances under which Job hopes to multiply his days ^{18b}: the part. in ^{19a} and the adj. in ^{20a} passing over into the impf. in the second clauses of each v. according to Dr. § 117. As Bu. remarks, the constr. in $^{19a.\ 20a}$ does not favour Sgf.'s proposal to place $^{19f.}$ after ^{6}.]

20. כבודי] Hfm. Be.^{K} Vo. כִּידֹנִי (Jer. 6^{23}): but an exact parallel to קשתי is not necessary; Job speaks, not as a warrior, but as a *moral* hero.

תחליף] *showed newness* or *freshness* (see on 14^{7}), was fresh and pliable—opposed to being old, hard, and useless.

21. לי שמעו] More direct and forcible than שמעו לי; cf. similar cases in Ps. 27^{8} 28^{7} 33^{21a} 63^{9} בי תמכה ימינך, 91^{14} 104^{20} 142^{8}, Pr. $8^{15.\ 16}$, 2 S. 23^{3}, Is. 45^{23}: in prose, Dt. 1^{37} 7^{6} 18^{15} $21^{17\ end}$,

Jg. 10[4]. [The emphatic לֹא takes a full stress; cf. Ps. 63[9], Pr 8[15. 16].]

וַיְחַלּוּ with d. f. euphon. (G–K. 20*i*); cf. Jg. 5[7], Baer (see his n., p. 94) חָדְלוּ. In 𝕸, ׳וְ will be the simple וְ (Dr. § 131 f.); but (Bu.), in view of the frequentatives in [20b. 21b. 22], it is better to read ישמעו, in which case it will be וְ *cons.*, and ויחלו will have, of course, a frequentative force (as Gn. 2[6. 10] etc.). Du. Be.[K], less suitably, change in [21. 23b] to וַ with שָׁנוּ, [22a]. יחל לְ, as Mic. 5[6b].

יִדְּמוּ] from דָּמַם: G–K. 67*g*.

לְמוֹ] see on 27[14]. Be.[K], needlessly [and on rhythmical grounds improbably], with 35 MSS (how "Vrs." can be quoted in support of this reading, is not apparent) לְמוֹעֲצָתִי.

22. דְּבָרִי] after *my word* or *speech*: but perhaps דִּבְּרִי (as 21[8]) should be read (Me. Di. Bi. Bu. Du.).

23. ויחלו] as יחל has occurred in [21a], Bu., for variety, וְחִכּוּ. Du., conversely, יְחַכּוּ in [21] (and וַיּחִלוּ, Hif. for וַיְחַלּוּ here: on Du.'s וַ, see on [21]).

כמטר] not כלמטר: G–K. 118*s*.

ופיהם פערו] Klo., improbably, כַּפֵּי הַמַּעֲרָפוֹת (Jl. 1[17]). 𝕲 is paraphrastic: so its support is very doubtful.

למלקוש] Du. כמלקוש (cf. EVV. "*as* for the latter rain"): but the fig. sense is clear from the context.

24. לא יאמינו] so Gi.: some 90 MSS, Baer (v. p. 50) ולא. "I used to smile on them (שחק אל, like *arrideo*, to *laugh*, or *smile*, *at* with approbation), when they believed not: viz. (Hi.), what I said or advised (לא יאמינו being a circ. cl., Dr. 162; though the other reading . . . וְלֹא may also express not a consequence, but a condition already existing, as 24[22] 42[3], Is. 45[4. 5], Ps. 44[18], Dr. 159 near the end). האמין abs. is to *believe* (Is. 7[9] 28[16] al.), not (cf. RVm.) to *be confident* (= בָּטַח). Bu. Du. consider that . . . ולא can only have the here impossible sense *and so they* . . . , and accordingly excise לא (so St.): but the omission is very violent, and, in view of the parallels just quoted, unnecessary."

אור פני] is commonly taken as = *my bright countenance*: but Bi.[1] Bu. Be. Du. object that though הפיל פנים might be

said (Jer. 3^{12}; cf. Gn. $4^{5.6}$, 1 S. 1^{18} LXX), הפיל אור פנים could hardly be said [yet, cf. נסה אור פניך, Ps. 4^{7}]: hence they suppose, very ingeniously, that לא יפילון is a corruption of ^{25c} אבלים ינחם; the correct text was written on the margin, and afterwards wrongly introduced after ^{25b}, with the addition of כאשר to make it intelligible: they thus read for ^{24b} ואור פני אבלים ינחם, "and the light of my countenance *comforted the mourners.*" But neither the corruption itself, nor the series of subsequent changes, can be said to be probable; and the "mourners," even allowing that they are unsuitable in ^{25c}, are still more so here; in ^{25c} they at least appear only in a comparison; but what place have they in a context which speaks of Job's giving his advice to an assembly of village elders?

25. אבחר דרכם] either (EVV. De. Du.) "I used to choose out *their way*" (the line of action they ought to follow; Job was the leader in his city and his clan, Du.), or (Di. Bu.) "I used to choose *the way to* (28^{23}) *them*"; the former puts greater significance into the words; it is also (Pe.) favoured by the fact that "choosing" implies the selection between alternative courses.

ראש] acc., defining the condition, = *as chief*: G–K. 118*n*.

גדוד] 19^{12} 25^{3}.

CHAPTER XXX.

1. "The v. admits of division into four lines (the first ending at עלי), but it halts rhythmically, and צעירים ממני לימים reads prosaically, and seems needlessly circumstantial" (so, in effect, Bu.). Me. Wr. Sgf. Bu. Be. om. ממני לימים (as a gloss from 32^{6}, cf. ^{4b}, perhaps originally written on the margin to give צעירים its supposed right sense, Bu.): צעירים is taken to mean *inferiors* (as Jer. 14^{3}), or צְעָרִים, *shepherd-boys* (Zec. 13^{7}; cf. Jer. $49^{20} = 50^{45}$), is read (Bi.[2] Bu. Be.); Bu., on the ground that the idea of Job having despised the *fathers* of the mockers is somewhat exaggerated, and that אבותם is "perhaps" also to be omitted as a dittograph of מאסתי, makes further omission, and so reduces the v. to two lines only: ועתה שחקו עלי צְעָרִים מְאַסְתִּים לשית עם כלבי צאני. But these operations [which after all produce a rhythmical effect (a poor 4 : 4 distich) scarcely superior to that of the existing text] are very questionable, and only partially supported by 𝔊 (in Swete: *νυνὶ δὲ κατεγέλασάν μου, ἐλάχιστοι* [*Θ οἱ νεώτεροι μου ἡμέραις*] *νῦν νουθετοῦσίν με ἐν μέρει, ὧν ἐξουδένουν τοὺς πατέρας αὐτῶν, οὓς οὐχ ἡγησάμην ἀξίους κυνῶν τῶν ἐμῶν νομάδων*, where *νῦν νουθ. με* seems to be another rendering of ועתה שחקו עלי). *ἐν μέρει* must somehow correspond to ממני לימים; *ὧν . . . αὐτῶν* (= אשר מאסתי אבותם) is supplied from Θ, and *οὓς κτλ.* is the original free rendering of אשר מאסתי וג׳, with omission of אבותם: 𝔊 thus seems to have differed from 𝔐 only by not reading *either* ממני *or* לימים, and אבותם. But is 𝔊's omission of אבותם of any greater significance than its omission (*e.g.*) of בערוץ נחלים or of עפר in ^{6}? [Richter's reconstruction of $^{1.\,2a}$ may be cited as a curiosity: ועתה שחקו עלי כאשר פני לא יפילון צעירים ממרום יוכיחני אשר מאסתי אבותם לשית עם כלבי צאני גם כח ידיהם למה לי. 𝔐 is poor, and it is improbable that in its present form it is original unless, or perhaps we

should say, even if redactional; in any case it is not worth while rewriting it to produce such a result as this.]

לשית] after מאסתי, מִשִּׁית might have been expected [cf. 1 S. 15[23. 26] Hos. 4[6]]; but we have both ל and מן after חָדַל, כָּלָה.

2. למה] *whereto? ad quid?* cf. Gn. 25[32] ולמה זה לי בכרה, 27[46] ולמה לי חיים. Du. כָּמַהּ לו (Ps. 63[2] † כָּמַהּ לך בשרי), *siecht hin*; but the change is unnecessary.

עלימו] [For the use of על "denoting with some emphasis the subj. of an experience" (*Lex. s.v.* על, 1 d), cf. Dan. 2[1] 10[8]].

כלח] 5[26] †, where see *n.* Ol. כָּלֹה, "all of it," viz. of כח, *strength*; Bu. כָּל־לֵחַ (Dt. 34[7] ולא נָס לֵחֹה); Che., כָּל־חַיִל (cf. 𝔖 ܟܠܗܘܢ ܕܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ). 𝔊 om.: *Θ* (*συντέλεια*), *'A* (*παντελές*) either read כָּלָה, or confused כלח with it. *Σ πᾶν τὸ πρὸς ζωήν* (whence Jer. *omnis vita*); כלח being perhaps taken as an abbreviation of כל־לחיים.

3. כפן] 5[22] †. Aram.: see *n.* on 5[22].

גלמוד] *stone-hard* (see on 3[7], cf. 15[34]); hence here, *stiff, shrivelled, gaunt.* Hi. Du. Oo. Honth. Bu. Be.[K] ("fort.") נָלַמּוּ "sind sie zusammengeschrumpft, eingeschrumpft"; but would *be rolled* or *folded up* (2 K. 2[8], cf. Ps. 139[16] נָּלְמִי) express naturally the effects of hunger on the body? And is it clear that Arab. *ṭawā'*, *convolvere, complicare*, and *ṭawiya*, *to be hungry* (Hi.), are connected?

הערקים] On the הַ, see Baer (p. 50), who cites הַעִוְרִים, 2 S. 5[6. 8], הַעֹזְבִים, Pr. 2[13], and his notes on Is. 42[18] 65[11]; G–K. 35*g*. ערק, to *gnaw*, as v.[17] †, Arab., and Syr. (in Lexx. and, in Pa., Zec. 11[17]: PS. 2997*f*). AV. RVm. *flee* (so 𝔊 *οἱ φεύγοντες*, 𝔗 Saad. Ḳi.). ערק, to *flee*, is a good Aram. √ (𝔗 and 𝔖 often): but *gnaw* yields a much more expressive figure. The art. (= *οἵτινες*, *men*, viz. *who* . . .), as 28[4], Ps. 19[11] 49[7].

אמש] is *yesterday* (= Arab. *'ams*), *yesternight* (Gn. 19[34] 31[29. 42]): hence, with a following gen. it can only, as Fleischer (*ap.* Del.) says, mean, *on the eve of*. . . . The sense thus obtained is legitimate, but poor. 𝔗 (חשוכא איך רומשא, darkness like evening) Rashi, Ḳi. Ges. De. Hi. al. *evening* (so RV. *gloom*); but this sense is out of the question; אמש does not mean *evening* absolutely, but only the day (or evening) of

yesterday (Fl. says similarly of *ams*, that it "never denotes evening or night absolutely; امسى in *Vit. Tim.* ii. 428, cited by Ges., is wrongly read and rendered by him *vespertinus*"). The word must be corrupt. Ol. Sgf. אֶ֫רֶץ, *the land of* . . .; but this yields a weak sense: Hfm. אֵם, the dry ground being described poetically as the "*mother* of wasteness and desolation"; Klo. better (so Bu.), אִמָּם, "their mother—fig. for the source from which they obtain nutriment—is wasteness and desolation." This agrees well with הערקים ציה, just before. [Du., connecting [3c] with [5], יָמֻשׁוּ or יְמַשְּׁשׁוּ.]

שואה ומשואה] so 38[27], Zf. 1[15]: the alliterative combination of two derivatives from the same √ expressing the idea of *completeness* (cf. Is. 29[2], Nah. 2[11], Ezk. 6[14] 33[29]; Ew. 313[c]). We might render "devastation and desolation"; but the alliteration cannot be reproduced effectively in English.

4. עלי שיח] *by* (*Lex.* 6 a (p. 755*b*): Nu. 24[6]). Does saltwort, however, grow particularly by, or under, bushes? [Di. *together with* (*Lex.* 4 c, p. 755*b*) *Artemisia*, assuming that שׂיח denotes here a particular species of desert shrub; but שׂיח is apparently used of desert shrubs in general in v.[7], Gn. 21[15], and still more generally in Gn. 2[5] †. Against too specific a limitation of the term, see most recently *ZATW*, 1915, p. 125 f.] Saad. وورق الشجر [𝔙 *et arborum cortices*] = עֲלֵי שִׂיחַ, "*and leaves of* bushes," which is possible (so Bu.), and is accepted by Be.[T] Honth.

לחמם] *their bread* (*food*): so EVV. Di. De. Du.; Ges. *for warming* at (לַחְמָם, as Is. 47[14], a rare form of the inf. of ע״ע vb., G-K. 67*cc*; or rd. (Bu.) לְחַמָּם, or (Bu. alt.; RVm.) Pi. לְחַמֵּם, as 39[14] *for warming* them). [Che. (*EBi.* 2647) for [b] proposes הערקים רתם וחלמות, 'הע from v.[8]: with 'ח cp. 6[6].]

5. גֵּו] a strong Aramaism (𝔗 גו, גַּוָּא, *midst*; Syr. ܓܰܘܳܐ *midst, interior*; often *community*, of a church, people, etc.; Ph. = *corporation*, in an inscription from the Piræus (Cooke, *NSI* 33[2]); Ar. *jawwun*, the *middle* or *interior*, *e.g.* of heaven, Qor. 16[81]): render, *from the midst* (viz. of men, understood), or (as in Syr.) *from the community*: Me. Be. al. מִדְּנֵי, but this is

weak and colourless; Bu. suggests (without adopting it) מן נו נוי, with a *paronomasia*; Ley מן נו אנשים; Grimme מן נוי אל נוי. No change seems necessary.

6. בערוץ נחלים] 14 MSS and several older edd. בערוץ. Either *in the most dreaded of* (41^{22}; G–K. 133*h*) *wâdys*, viz. on account of their gloom, and wildness, and solitude (so De. Di. Bu. Du. Pe. RVm.); or, from Ar. عَرْضٌ, a *gully* or *defile* (Lane, 2008*a*), *in a gully of the wâdys* (so Wetzst., Hi. RV.). [The parallelism of חרי עפר favours the latter rendering.]

לשכן] = *must they dwell*: the so-called "periphrastic" future (Dr. 204; G–K. 114*k*; Ps. 32^{9}, Hos. 9^{13} al.): so Di. De. Hi. etc. Bu. *to dwell*, carrying on ^{5a}: the position of לשכן somewhat favours the usual rendering (Du.), but it is not, of course, incompatible with Bu.'s view.

חֹרֵי עפר] [the force of בְּ in ^{a} extends to this phrase also: cf. 15^{8} n. For חר of hiding places, see 1 S. 14^{11} (also 13^{6} reading חורים for חוחים), of lions' *dens*, Na. 2^{13}: hence probably חרי, *Horite* = troglodyte]. עפר, *dust*, of the surface of the earth generally; cp. 5^{6} 14^{8} 41^{25}, Is. $2^{10.19}$).

כפים] Jer. 4^{29} †. An Aram. word; cf. Κῆφας. [כפים may be, and is generally taken to be, a second gen. (cf. G–K. 128*a*) dependent on חרי—(*holes* . . .) *of the rocks*. But Jer. 4^{29} (באו בעבים ובכפים עלו) rather suggests that כפים may be a third term dependent on בְּ—(they must dwell . . .) *in rocks*: cp. בְּ with the synonymous term סלע in 1 S. 13^{6} ויתחבאו . . . בסלעים.]

7. שיחים] [see on עלי שיח, v.^{4}].

ינהקו] see on 6^{5} †.

יספחו] ספח is to *join*, *attach* (Is. 14^{1} ונספחו על בית יעקב; 1 S. 2^{36b} 26^{19}): the sense needed is, however, not *are attached*, but *attach themselves to one another*—or, as we should say, *are huddled together*,—and this is better expressed by the Nif. (G–K. 51*d*) יִסָּפֵחוּ (Hfm. Bu. Be. Du.; Di. alt.). RVm. *stretch themselves* [lit. *pour themselves out*], from (De.) √ ספח [*to pour out* (14^{19} n.)].

8. בני נבל וג׳] not the subject of נכאו, but an (implicit) accus., defining the state [1^{21} n. 4^{7} n.] (Dr. 161. 2 with *n.* 2: cf.

e.g. Ex. 13[18] וחמשים עלו), "*as* (or *being*) children of . . . , they are scourged," etc.

נבל] not "feeble-witted" (Pea.), but [godless]. נבל expresses deficiency, not of *intellect*, but of *moral* and *religious* sense: [see, further, Dr. *Samuel* [2], 260; *Parallel Psalter*, 457].

בני בלי שם] [with the cstr. before the negative compound expression, cp. מכת בלתי סרה (Is. 14[6]) lit., *a stroke of non-cessation* (G–K. 130*a*); but in view of בני נבל the present phrase means not *sons of no name*, *i.e.* men without reputation (*Lex. s.v.* בן, 8), but *sons of nameless* (people); the compound expression is virtually an adj. used as a noun defining people].

נִכְּאוּ] from נָכָא = נָכָה (G–K. 75*rr*); the Nif. of either does not, however, occur elsewhere. Be.[T] suggests נִדְפְּאוּ; but why "are *crushed*"? 𝔊 καὶ κλέος ἐσβεσμένον = וְשֵׁם נִכְבָּה.

9. מלה] see on 4[2]. In the sense of (by-) *word* (𝔊 θρύλημα, 𝔙 proverbium) only here.

10. מֶנִּי] see on 21[16].

מפני] withheld not spitting *from my face*, *i.e.* shrunk not from spitting in my face (Is. 51[6]). RVm. *at the sight of me* (lit. *from before me*) is in the abstract quite possible (Lv. 19[32] מפני שיבה תקום; *Lex.* 818*a*, top); but it is not natural with the *negative*, לא חשכו. *Before me*, *in* (not *at*) *my presence*, would, of course, be לְפָנַי.

11. יתרו] so Kt. 𝔊𝔙; יתרי Qrê, many MSS, 𝔖𝔗. An interpretation is difficult. יֶתֶר is [apart from 4[21]] a *bowstring*, Jg. 16[7. 8. 9] (see Moore), Ps. 11[2] † (cf. Arab. *watar*, the *string* of a bow, or the *chord* of a lute): hence (Capellus, Di. Du.) *he hath loosened* (12[18], Is. 45[1]) *my bowstring*, *i.e.* incapacitated me (the opposite of 29[20b]), the fig. being that of a warrior disarmed by his bowstring being loosened. Del. similarly, only taking יתרי in the sense of *tent-cord*, fig. for the *cord of life*, as 4[21]; but there is nothing here, like נִסַּע there, to suggest this figure. [b] will thus mean: And they (the outcasts of vv.[2-10]) cast off the bridle (of respect, which has previously restrained them) from before him, and heap insults upon him. Upon this view the subj. in [11a] is God, and [11b] describes what happens when He withdraws from Job the power to defend himself. But the

subj. in [a] and [b] might be the same, the sg. in [a] referring to a typical individual of the class referred to (as often), or פִּתְּחוּ וַיְעַנּוּנִי being read (so Bu.): "For my cord (*i.e.* the cord, fig. of authority, laid upon them: Bu. alt. יִתְרָם, *their cord*—in the same sense) they have loosened, and humbled me; And cast off the bridle (of respect) from before me": their casting off all regard for Job's authority, and their loss of respect for him, being the ground of their treatment of him described in [9. 10]. Or the numbers in [a] and [b] may be assimilated (Di.[2] Be. Du.) by reading שִׁלֵּחַ in [b] with 𝔊 (Θ) and 𝔙. Du., regarding [12] רגלי שלחו as a variant of [11] רסן שלחו, and neither as yielding any sense, reads in [11b] (with omission of רגלי שלחו in [12]) דִּגְלִי מִפָּנַי (or, better, שִׁלֵּחַ (שִׁלֵּךְ) (דגלי being due to Bi.[2]): "He (God) hath loosened my bowstring, and humbled me, *my banner* from before me he hath cast down." 𝔊 for [11] has: *ἀνοίξας γὰρ φαρέτραν αὐτοῦ ἐκάκωσέν με*, [[11b] = Θ] *καὶ χαλινὸν τοῦ προσώπου μου ἐξαπέστειλεν.*

12. פרחח †] 25 MSS פִּרְחָה. [𝔗 בניתן, perhaps = פרחם.] For פרחח, if correct, see G–K. 84[b]*m*. Apparently, *a* (low) *brood*, the brood of these nameless parents: a term of disparagement. Cf. فَرْخٌ, both a *young bird* (אֶפְרֹחַ, Ps. 84[4] al.), and also a *base* or *abject man*, who is driven away: Lane, 2362*c*; [cp. also פרחי כהנה, *youths* (cp. פרח, *blossoms*) *of the priesthood*: *Midd.* 1[8], *Joma*, 1[7] בקש להתנמנם פרחי כהנה מכין לפניו באצבע, if he (the high priest) attempted to go to sleep, young priests flipped their fingers before him. In this Mishnic usage, however, the word has not the contemptuous suggestion of the Arabic].

על ימין] mentioned, not because the accuser stood at the right hand (Ps. 109[6]), but because on his right hand a man is strongest, and feels most secure: even there these outcasts assail and taunt Job. [So we may best explain, if the text is correct, though in this case על־ימיני would be more natural. Ehrlich, *Against old age* (lit. *days*) *youth rises up*. But most probably עָלַי should be read (Bu. Honth. Sgf. al.), עלי in [b] being either a correct variant of על ימין, or a dittograph of עלי in [a]. Unfortunately 𝔊 failed to translate the line.] 𝔊 (Θ)

ἐπὶ δεξιῶν βλαστοῦ ἐπανέστησαν. Du.: "in [12a] we recognize יקומו . . . עָלַי, 'against me . . . there rise up'; what stands between these words must be the subj.: מין פרחח [in the older writing מנפרחח] without any too violent change" yields מַעַרְכֹתָיו, *his* (God's) *lines* (of warriors) (fig. of calamities; cf. 16[13f.] 19[12] etc.). Very clever and attractive; agreeing well with the fig. of assailants of a fortress in [c]; and perhaps (though not necessarily) right.

רגלי שלחו] *my feet they send on* (14[20]), *i.e.* they hunt me on from place to place. But this yields a poor sense, out of harmony with the context: even in [c] the foes are still only *approaching* Job. Ew. Di. (with Θ πόδα αὐτῶν ἐξέτειναν) רַגְלֵיהֶם or רַגְלָם, Bi.[1] רֶגֶל שלחו, Honth. רַגְלֵימוֹ, they *let go their feet*, *i.e.* rush at me (cf. 18[8] כי שֻׁלַּח ברשת ברגליו; Jg. 5[15]). But even so the sense is poor, and the words seem unnecessary: [moreover, they form a short line interrupting the well-balanced distich (3 : 3) formed by [a. b]]; so Me. Wr. Sgf. Bu. Du. Be. St. are probably right in regarding them (in spite of their being recognized in Θ) as an inexact dittograph of שלחו . . . רסן in [11].

13. נתסו] for נתצו (so 5 MSS); only here. [נתץ elsewhere occurs either (1) of destroying buildings by pulling them *down*, or (2) metaphorically. Here, if the text is correct, the vb. is used exceptionally of breaking *up* a path, and so rendering it impassable.]

נְתִיבָתִי] 3 MSS, Θ 𝔖𝔙𝔗 נתיבֹתי.

להיתי] rd. with [the Oriental] Qrê [and the Western text] לְהַוָּתִי; see Gi. and Ba. and n. on 6[2].

יֹעִילוּ לי] "Unsinn" (Du.): [but, if correct] cf. עָזַר ל, Zec. 1[15]. 𝔖 Grä. יָגִילוּ, *rejoice*; but Job's assailants here are not merely rejoicing at his troubles, they are represented as actively *adding* to them ([12c. 13d. 14]).

לא עֹזֵר למו] "a genuine Arabic description of these pariahs of Ḥauran. Schultens compares a place in the Ḥamāsa, 'We see you ignoble, poor, *laisa lakum min sāir-in-nāsi nāṣirun*, you have *no helper* among other men'" (Del.). But the context seems to point to more serious assailants than the outcasts of vv.[2-10]; hence עֹצֵר (Di. Du. Be. Grä. Honth. St.),

"there is *none to restrain them*," is a very probable correction, [if the entire v. is not more seriously at fault]. Bi.^{2} for ^{13} has נָתַם נְתִבֹתִי לְהַוָּתִי יַעֲלוּ וְלֹא עֹזֵר לִי. 𝔊 for $^{13b.\,c.\,14}$ has *ἐξέδυσαν γάρ μου τὴν στολήν* ("for להותי יעלו reading or conjecturing חָלְצוּ מֵעָלַי," Du.). *βέλεσιν αὐτοῦ κατηκόντισέν με* (=?; =? ^{14a} בְּחִצָּיו רַבָּה אֹתִי, Be.), *κέχρηταί μοι ὡς βούλεται* (? = בחפץ for בפרץ, ^{14a}, Be.). *ἐν ὀδύναις πέφυρμαι* (seemingly = ^{14b} !). From such a free rendering textual criticism can learn little or nothing. Du., however, taking hints from מעלי and *βέλεσιν αὐτοῦ*, makes, "with bold changes" (Bu.), out of vv.$^{13.\,14a}$ the two distichs (in which, it is true, the two middle clauses preserve well the figures of ^{13a} and ^{14a}): נתסו נתיבתי יֶהֶרְסוּ מַעְגָּלָי אֵלַי עָטְרוּ רֹמָיו כפרץ רחב יאתיו (א׳ ע׳ ר׳, *His archers compass me about*, for לא עזר למו: עטר אל, as 1 S. 23^{26}; רמיו, as Jer. 4^{29}). [Neither the rhythm of 𝔐 in v.^{13} (2 : 2 : 2) nor that of the first distich of Du.'s emendation (2 : 2) is the normal rhythm of Job, though for the one cp. 17^1 n., for the other, 19^{14} n. The parallelism of 𝔐 is bad, of Bi.'s emendation poor, of Du.'s first distich, at least, good. 𝔐 even with עצר for עזר is scarcely tolerable.]

14. [תחת שאה התגלגלו] *under the crash* of the falling masonry of the breached (פרץ ^{a}) walls, *they*, *i.e.* Job's enemies, *have rolled on*: so substantially, *e.g.*, EV. Di. Du. Bu. If the root meaning of שאה be noisiness (cp. *Isaiah*, *ICC*, p. 193 (on 10^3)), there is no reason why the word should not here refer to the noise of falling masonry, though it does not happen to do so elsewhere, the commoner reference being to the *crash* of a storm (cp. esp. Ezk. 38^9 ועלית כשואה תבוא כענן; and תשוה below, v.^{22} with n.). But whether, without the addition of עלי, התגלגלו can mean, like התגלל על in Gn. 43^{18} †, *to assail* with overwhelming force, is open to question; if not, the whole phrase is not, perhaps, a very natural expression for the attack or advance of the enemy. *If* 34^{26} justified taking תחת as a syn. of כ (Hitz., who also appealed for this meaning to Gn. 30^2, Hab. 3^7, which must certainly be otherwise explained, Ehrlich, Honth.), it would be better to render *like a storm they have rolled on* (cp. Ezk. 38^9), than, with Hitz., to render תחת שאה, "als ein Sturzbach" (cp. Rabbinic *Comm. on Job*, ed. Wright and Hirsch, which explains שואה by מטר סוחף). For this, though it

would give a good parallel to פרץ, taken in the sense of פרץ מים, 2 S. 5[20] (cp. RVm. here), places on שאה an entirely unsupported and improbable meaning. The truth is, the entire method of interpretation which would explain [14b] as a parallel to [14a] is precarious: [15b] and [15c] are certainly parallels (note the parallel terms כרוח ‖ כעב, נדבתי ‖ ישעתי); this leaves [15a] (the text and meaning of which are sufficiently clear) as the probable fellow to [14b]; this suggests that התגלגלו was originally 1st pers. sing. (‖ to החפך עלי in [15a]), and expressed the treatment (cf. Jer. 51[25]) or condition (2 S. 20[12]) of the assailed, *i.e.* of Job, not of the assailants. As a matter of fact, 𝔊 has the 1st pers. (*πέφυρμαι*), though in view of the free rendering of 𝔊 in these verses (see above) too much weight must not be attached to this.]

15. [הָהְפַּךְ] cf. 20[25] (as emended). The constr. is sufficiently explained by G–K. 121*b* (cf. 28[18]; and with a Hof., Ex. 10[8] 27[7]). The Hof., however, is found only here: hence Du., with 1 MS, תֵּהָפֵךְ (G–K. 145*k*); Be.[K] תֵּהָפֵךְ or נֶהֶפְכוּ. But how can Be.[K] say "l.c. 𝔊𝔖 נהפכו"? Supposing 𝔊𝔖 read הָהְפַּךְ, how could this be expressed in Greek or Syriac except by a plural verb? EVV. have "are turned"; and their translators beyond question read הָהְפַּךְ.

[תרדף] the 3 f. sg. referring to בלהות, G–K. 145*k*, as 27[20], with the same subj. But "pursue" is a poor and unsuitable idea: rd. with Bu. Grä. Du. Be. (alt.) תִּנָּדֵף, *is driven away* (Ps. 68[3]).

[נדבתי] 𝔊 *μου ἡ ἐλπίς*; Bu. טוֹבָתִי; Vo. תִּקְוָתִי.

[ישעתי] 'י here means material *welfare*, easy circumstances; cp. ישע in 2 S. 23[5], and in Arabic سعة, *abundance*, *amplitude*, of fortune: *e.g.* سعة من المال, *abundance* of money, Qor. 2[248]; لينفق ذو سعة من سعته, let him that hath *abundance* give of his abundance, 65[7]: cp. 24[22]. Arabic also retains the original physical meaning of the root, *to be wide*, *broad*: *e.g.* إنّ أرضى واسعة, My earth is *broad*, Qor. 29[56]; Ex. 34[24] (Saad) وسّع = הרחיב. In Hebrew the more common meaning of ישע, ישעה is *deliverance*, *salvation*, though, as Dr. well points out (on 1 S.

14^{45}), the terms regularly retain in Hebrew, even with this nuance, the *material* sense which is specially illustrated by this passage and the passages in the Qor., and seldom, if ever, even in the prophets, express a *spiritual* state exclusively.]

16. עלי] For this very idiomatic עלי—not to be omitted (Bi.[1]–Bi.[2] omits the whole v., Du.), even for the metre—cf. Ps. 42^5; and see on 10^1. [If the 4 : 3 rhythm (17^{14} n.) of 𝕸 needs to be restored to 3 : 3, omit rather ועתה as a dittograph of ועתה(ש י) in v.[15]: so Be.[K] with a ?.]

ימי] Du. אֵמֵי [if not חבלי, as 36^8], *the terrors of* (on the ground that 𝕸 produces a disagreeable repetition in [27b], and that ימי may have been suggested by לילה in v.[17]; but see next n.).

17. [The rhythm in 𝕸 is again 4 : 3 (17^{14} n.), if not 2 : 2 : 2 (17^1 n.); but possibly לילה (suggested by ימי in [16] (see n.)) or מעלי, which is not apparently suitable for reference to bones (Du.), is an addition.]

לילה נִקַּר] Either (Di. Del. Du. Be.) *the night* (personified, as 3^3) *corrodes*, or *by night he* (God) *corrodes* . . . , or (Bu.) נִקַּר may be read (constr. as v.[15a]: G–K. 121*b*). נקר is to *bore*: in Pi. to *work at boring*, to *bore away piecemeal* (G–K. 52*f*) = to *corrode*.

מעלי] *from upon me*, a frequent constr., like Dt. 8^4 לא בָלְתָה מעליך, did not wear away (and fall) *from upon* thee, 29^4 (*Lex.* 758*b*). So v.[30].

ערקי] *my gnawers* (v.[3]), *i.e.* my gnawing (pains). AV. RVm. *my sinews*, following Kimchi [and Ibn Ezra, who says that in Arabic the word means נידים]: so already 𝔊 (*νεῦρα* [elsewhere = גיד]); [cp. Aram. ערקא, ערקתא, the leather *thong* (of a shoe), or a leather *strap*, and similarly ܥܪܩܐ, ܥܪܩܬܐ: Arab. عَرَقَة, *nervus* bovis quo percuti solet (Freytag from *Qamūs*). Nachmanides, comparing ערקין דברזל, Ezk. 27^{19} 𝔗, explains the word here as *veins* (see Levy, *Chald. Wörterbuch*, 247*b*); this would give a good parallel to עצמי; but no better a parallel and not so good a subj. to ישכבון as עֲרָקַי, *my fleshless bones*; cp. عَرْق, a bone of which the flesh has been consumed (Ehrlich)].

18. יתחפש] התחפש, lit. to let oneself be sought for and so

to *disguise* (1 S. 28[8], 1 K. 20[38] 22[30]), *disfigure oneself*. [𝔊 Sgf. Be.[T] (Be.[K] with a ?), Ehrlich יִתְפַּשׂ; in this case it would be best, with Ehrlich, also to emend in [b]: בפי for כפי and יאחזני for יאזרני.] Bu. בְּשָׂרִי for לבושי (through an intermediate error בשי, corrected to לבשי on account of the ‖ כתנתי): this would be very suitable so far as [a] goes, but it agrees badly with [b], "like my tunic, it (my flesh) girds me"; כפי, it is true, means *according to*, but as a mere particle of comparison כְּ is regularly employed, so that the ordinary rendering *like* (the collar, lit.) *the mouth of* has a strong presumption to be the correct one; יאזרני, also, is more than "umfängt mich." Du. ברב כַּחַשׁ יִתְחַבֵּא לבושי, through great leanness (16[8]) my garment contracts itself (zieht sich zusammen); but, though כחש (so Renan, Wr.) may very well be right, the sense given for יתחבא rests upon the very doubtful view that it is a by-form (or scribal error) for יתחמא (from חֶמְאָה, *curdled milk*), *sich verdichten* (see Du. on 38[30]). Peake, in calling it an "excellent" emendation, cannot have noticed the grounds upon which it rests.

19. הֹרָנִי] He (*i.e.* God; see on 3[20]) hath cast me: הוֹרָה, like יָרָה, Ex. 15[4] al.: the Hif. [= *to cast*] elsewhere only of shooting *arrows*, as 1 S. 20[36] al. The clause is very short: Bu. Honth. rd. הרני אֶל; Vo. הוֹרִיתַנִי [which prepares the way for the 2nd pers. in v.[20]]; Du. (on account of the Hif. in the otherwise unattested *general* sense of *cast*) הוֹרִדַנִי אֶל. הוֹרִדַנִי is probable: with its two beats, אֶל might be dispensed with [yet neither הוריתני nor הוֹרִדַנִי is very likely to have received a double stress. Insert הנה before הרתני (cp. הנה before the 2nd pers. pf. in 4[3] and before the 1st pers. pf. in 13[18] 33[2], and הן before the 1st pers. pf. in 21[27] 32[11]), or הן־אל before הר[ד]ני: cp. 8[20] 36[22]. The loss arose from the eye passing from the ה of הן־אל or הנה to that of הרני].

20b. I stand (in prayer, and waiting for an answer), but thou (merely) lookest closely (31[1] sq. על; 37[14] sq. acc.; sq. אל, 1 K. 3[21], Is. 14[16]; sq. ב, Jer. 30[24]) at me (doing nothing more); but we should expect something more definite to be expressed by both verbs. 1 MS 𝔖 Me. Hi. Bu. Be. עמדתָּ, "*thou* standest, and lookest (unmoved) at me," where, the subj. of both verbs being now the same, *thou standest* does

a little point the way to the meaning of ותתבונן: the thought is also suitable, but some such expression as ***and hidest thy face***, or ***and lookest away*** (cf. 7[19] 10[20]), is still what would be expected. MS[598] 𝔙 (et non respicis me) ולא תתבונן בי: so Bi.[1] (Bi.[2] with 𝔊 omits the line), Sgf. Be. St. Vo. In view of the very forced sense which upon other interpretations has been pressed upon התבונן, it seems best to adopt this reading (with *I stand*): the לא may have been omitted upon dogmatic grounds. Du. obtains the same sense, less satisfactorily, by reading עָמַדְתָּ מֵהִתְבּוֹנֵן בִּי, thou ***hast stopped*** (Gn. 29[35] ותעמד מִלֶּדֶת) ***from*** paying attention to me.

21. תשטמני] 𝔊 *με ἐμαστίγωσας* = תְּשַׁטְּטֵנִי.

22. תְּשֻׁוָּה, Kt.; תְּשִׁיָּה, Qrê] תְּשֻׁוָּה stands for—or, better, is an error for—תְּשׁוּאָה or (36[29] 39[7]) תְּשֻׁאָה, the *crash* of the storm (as 36[29]),—an accus. either (Di.) of motion (cf. [23] מָוֶת) or, better, of the product (see G-K. 117*ii*), Job representing himself hyperbolically, not merely as vanishing ***in***, but as dissipated ***into***, the crash of the storm. The Qrê תְּשִׁיָּה (see on 5[12]), as it stands, yields no sense: but Du., insisting that the Kt., if adopted, must be understood literally (which, of course, is out of the question), prefixing מן, adopts it, reading מִתְּשִׁיָּה, "dissolvest me *ohne Bestand, ohne Halt*" (cf. *Θ καὶ ἀπέρριψάς με ἀπὸ σωτηρίας*—though this is slender evidence that מִ was ***read***); but this gives תְּשִׁיָּה a highly questionable sense (see p. 31 f.). 𝔊 *ἔταξας δέ με ἐν ὀδύναις* (now [22a]; but, as Bi.[2] pointed out, in reality = [22b] 𝔐; Origen, not perceiving this, supplied from *Θ* wrongly, as [22b] *καὶ ἀπέρριψάς με ἀπὸ σωτηρίας*). 𝔖 (ܘܡܣܟܠܬܢܝ ܘܐܪܦܝܬܢܝ), 𝔗 (ותמסני בתשייתא; v. *ChWb.* ii. 564), 𝔙 (elisisti me valide) do not recognize either תשיה or (at least distinctly) תְּשֻׁוָּה, but see in it mostly some word suggesting the idea of ***pain*** or ***weakness*** (cf. 𝔗 חשש, to be ***weak***).

23. מָוֶת תשיבני] with omission of כי, as Ps. 9[21], Am. 5[12] al. Du., arguing that to bring ***back*** to death (where Job has not been before) is an unsuitable idea, reads תְּשִׁיבֵנִי, wilt make me ***dwell with*** death (*i.e.* in Sheol); but the accus. of place after הושיב is questionable, nor is the change itself necessary (see on 1[21]).

24. Obviously corrupt. 𝕸 has been rendered: (1) Howbeit in a ruin will not one stretch out a hand (to save himself)? Or in his calamity (will there not be) therefore a cry for help? So substantially Ew. Hrz. Del. Dav. and RVm., though בְּעִי cannot mean lit. "in his fall"; עִי is a *ruined heap*, Jer. 26[18], Ps. 79[1] al.; לָהֶן, lit. *for these things*, in a neuter sense, cf. on בָּהֶם, 22[21], or לָהֵן, Di., as Ru. 1[13] (*Lex.* 1099*a*), and (Aram.) Dn. 2[6]; but the constr. remains harsh: שׁוּעַ, *cry for help*, cf. Is. 22[5] [if the text be correct], וְשׁוֹעַ אל־ההר, Ps. 5[3] לְקוֹל שַׁוְעִי; (2) Surely against a ruin (fig. for Job, who describes his shattered frame as a heap of ruins) one (*or* he, *i.e.* God) will not stretch out a (hostile) hand; Or do they (his hands) gain riches (שׁוּעַ, as 36[19]) in its calamity (the calamity of the ruin, virtually = the calamity of another man)? So Hi. and substantially Dav. alt., AV. also in [a]. שׁלח יד ב׳, as 28[9]: but the rendering of [b] is extremely forced. טֹבֵעַ for בעי, and לא יְשַׁוֵּעַ for לחן שוע, suggested tentatively by Di., yield a satisfactory sense and have been generally accepted (*e.g.* by Bi. Bu. Du.): "Howbeit, will not one *sinking* stretch out a hand? and in his calamity *will* not *one cry for help?*" Be. objects that שׁלח יד does not, like פרשׂ יד, mean *stretch out a hand* (for help), but would rather mean *stretch forth a* (helping) *hand*, and proposes (as Wr. [previously in the interest of a rather different interpretation of the v.) בְּעָנִי for בעי, rendering, Have I (reading אשׁלח, but שׁלחתי would be better: cp. the pfs. in [25]) not given a (helping) hand to the poor, And (Be., not Wr., reading לא נושע for לחן שוע) was he not saved (by me) in his calamity?]. Be.'s objection to the use of שׁלח יד in the alternative emendation is scarcely conclusive; for if, as in his own, it means to extend the hand to take hold of the poor in order to help him, why should it not mean to extend the hand to catch at something in order to save oneself? [Yet on other grounds Be.'s emendation deserves consideration: see exegetical n.]

25. [אם־לא וגו׳] *Is it that I wept not . . . that my soul grieved not?* (No; I did weep). The interrog. אם expecting the answer *No*, as 6[12] (*Lex.* 50*b*). The force of לא in [a] extends to [b] as in 28[17]; G-K. 152*z*. If v.[25] is a misplaced fragment of c. 31, then אם לא means as usual *if not*, and its force extends to [b].]

[קְשֵׁה יוֹם] "*unfortunate*, lit. *hard of day*, *i.e.* one upon whom times are hard (cp. *δυσημερία*)"—Dr. on 1 S. 1^{15}, where 𝔊 reads קשת יום (𝔐 רוח).]

[עָגְמָה נפשי†] cf. Is. 19^{10} אַגְמֵי נפש†. 𝔗 עֲגַם here and Ru. 1^{13} (עֲגִימָן for תֵּעָגֵנָה); נפשו עֲגוּמָה, *Ber.* 55*b*, al.

[לאביון] Du. אבד for אביון, נפשו for נַפְשִׁי, בְּכִי or בָּכִית, *weeping*, for בכיתי.]

26. [ואיחלה] וָ׳ is anomalous for וָ׳ (so, *e.g.*, Jg. 6^9, 2 S. 1^{10}; Dr. § 66 *n.*; G–K. 49*c*), which, however, should no doubt be read.

28. [הִלַּכְתִּי] the intensive Pi. (G–K. 52*f*), as Ps. 38^7 כל־היום קֹדר הִלַּכְתִּי (and often in other connections, as 24^{10}).

[בלא חַמָּה] קֹדר הִלַּכְתִּי means (go about)—not mourning *mentally*, but *squalid* and *dark* in attire and appearance (cf. on 5^{11}): Ew. now refers קֹדר to the dark, unkempt skin of a mourner (*quasi sordida vestis*), Del. to the dark colour of the sackcloth worn in mourning, Di. to his "schmutzig trübe Aussehen." Del. then understands בלא חמה, *without the sun*, as = בלא אור חמה, of Job's *sunless* (*i.e.* miserable) condition; Di. renders to go darkened (in appearance, *i.e.* in skin), *without* (8^{11} = *but not by*) the sun. Hi. Du. I go blackened, but not by the sun (the reference being to the dark skin of a leper; but this seems to anticipate v.^{30}, where (Del.) the blackening of the skin is referred to, with the word properly expressing it, שחר). Bu. argues that with הִלַּכְתִּי, קֹדר can refer only to the attire, not to the skin; and hence rejects Di.'s explanation, because (as Di. himself had said) if קדר refers to the dark *attire*, בלא חמה would be pointless, as it would be obvious to every one that darkness of attire would not be produced by the sun; but the argument is hardly conclusive. חמה [etymologically] denotes the sun (Is. 24^{23} 30^{26}, Ca. 6^{10}†), not on the side of its *light*, but on that of its *warmth* (Ps. 19^7), and this might be thought to favour Di.'s explanation: on the other hand, in actual usage, it seems to denote the sun as a source of light even more than as a source of warmth, so that the etymology seems to have been disregarded. It must be admitted that בלא חמה yields an ambiguous and unsatisfactory sense. Of the emendations

proposed, the neatest is Du.'s בלא נֶחָמָה, *without comfort* (6^{10}), which is very attractive (so Bu.): others are (Voigt) בלא חֶדְוָה, *without joy* (Aram.: also 1 Ch. 16^{27}, Neh. 8^{10}†), (Be.[K]) בלא חֲמֻדָה = *undesired* (cp. 2 Ch. 21^{20}). 𝔊 (ἄνευ φιμοῦ, corrupt for θυμοῦ) expresses בלא חֵמָה (so Σ ἀθυμῶν, 𝔖𝔙; 1 MS חֵימָה, and 2 MSS חֵמָה); but this is evidently unsuited to the context. Still the rendering shows that 𝔊 had the same consonants as 𝔐.

[בקהל אשוע] Du. בִּקְהַל שׁוּעָלִים; but this anticipates v.[29] and gives a bad parallel whether to בלא חמה (𝔐), or to Du.'s emendation בלא נחמה in [a]. Moreover] Du. does not make Job a jackal, or even (as v.[29]) *like* jackals: and if the "assembly of jackals" is (as it must be) to be understood figuratively, why may not [𝔐] קהל (of men) be so understood? [Be[K] rather feebly בקול or בקולי for בקהל.]

28. אשוע] the impf. has almost the force of a final clause [—*crying* or *to cry*]; cf. 16^{8} 24^{14} (Dr. 163; G-K. 120*c*, 156*e*) [with the notes there: cp., further, Ps. 88^{11} 102^{14} both, as here, after קום].

קַמְתִּי] not קָ׳ [and consequently not בקהל, but בִּקְ׳]: see Del.

30. מעלי] מֵעַל frequent, as v.[17].—𝔊 μεγάλως.

חָרָה] from חרר (cf. Ps. 102^{4} ועצמותי כמוקד נִחָרוּ): עֶצֶם, fem., as 19^{20}, Ps. 102^{6} (דבקה עצמי לבשרי).

CHAPTER XXXI.

1. ומה] *how, then, . . . ?* Of course, a negative answer is expected. Interrog. pronouns and adverbs are often in Heb. used rhetorically to express the sense of a negative (as *Who . . . ? = no one*, or *Where . . . ? = nowhere*); and in Arab. ما (= מה) has become an ordinary negative. Cf. Ca. 8^{4} (after השבעתי אתכם) מַה־תָּעִירוּ (for which the ‖ 2^{7} has אם־תעירו); and see *Lex.* p. 553*b*. Du. מֶהִתְבּוֹנֵן: correct Hebrew, but prosaic.

2. [חלק אלוה] the gen. is subjective: the lot which God allots; elsewhere after חלק it is objective (Ehrlich): the lot which is allotted to some one; so, *e.g.*, 20^{29}, Dt. 32^{9}, and especially c. 27^{13}. So with נחלת, subjective gen., ct. 27^{13} (objective), but cp. Ps. 127^{3} נחלת יהוה בנים.]

[ממרומים . . . ממעל] 3^{4} n.]

3. לְעַוָּל] Grimme, *m. c.* לַעֲוָלִים.—Ley, Du. נָכוֹן, *m. c.* after לְעַוָּל.

נֶכֶר †] Ob.[12] נֹכֶר †.

5. שוא] Bi.[1] Ley, *m. c.* אנשי שוא (cp. עם א' רשע, 34^{8}); 2 MSS Bi.[2] Grimme מתי שוא (11^{11}): but the ‖ has the abstract מרמה.

ותַּחַשׁ] an anomalous punctuation for וַתָּחַשׁ (from חוש), which no doubt should be read (G–K. 72 ff.). וַתַּחַשׁ could only come normally from חָשָׁה, *to be silent*. Cf. וַתַּעַט, 1 S. 15^{19}, which should be וַתָּעַט (from עיט).

[על] for אֶל: *Lex.* 41*a*.]

6. [ישקלני] indef. subj.: G–K. 144*d*; but Di. treats אלוה in ᵇ as the subj. of ᵃ also, it being first mentioned in ᵇ for rhythmical reasons.]

7. [מִנִּי־הדרך] Rd. מִנִּי דרך or מן־הדרך, as "מני [6^{16} n.] in Job occurs only here before the art. or a toneless syll." (Bu.).

מאום] with quiescent א (G–K. 23*c*), for the normal מום

(11^{15}), as Dn 1^{4} †. 1 MS and the Orient. Kt., מְאוּמָה, *anything*. 𝕾 (ܡܕܡ), 𝕿 (מִדְּעַם חבולא), need not have read מאומה, but may have only taken מאום as = מאומה. If the reading is correct, מאום would seem to be the original form (Kö. ii. 146); but no √ מָאַם is known.

8. ישרשו] Be.[K] ירושו (from רוש), *are impoverished*,—taking צאצאים in its usual sense of *offspring* [5^{25} 21^{8} 27^{14}]. Needless: see Is. 42^{5} (הארץ וצאצאיה); [and note the parallelism here, *let me sow*. Though, perhaps, if the *produce of* Job's *fields* was intended, we should read צאצאֵי שָׂדַי; this yields a better rhythm, and שדי may easily have been lost through haplography. This is preferable to inserting כל before צאצאי, or, on the ground of ἐπὶ γῆς in 𝔊's paraphrase, adding בארץ—Be.[T] (only tentatively)].

9. על אשה] [על *on account of* (as, *e.g.*, Gn. 21^{12}, Dt. 24^{16}, Ps. 44^{23}; *Lex.* 754*a*), unless על is here used for אל (v.[5] n.), in which case *unto* (RV.); cp. the probably dependent passage Ecclus. 9^{9} אליה לבך (? l. תִּפָּתֶה) פן תטה. אשה (*married woman, wife*, (as, *e.g.*, Pr. 6^{29}, Lev. 18^{8} (*Lex.* 61*a*)) as the parallel here indicates].

על־פתח] [*by*, or *about*, *the door of*; not *at the door of*, *i.e.* immediately in front of, or in the doorway, which is regularly expressed by the acc. פתח with following gen. (so, *e.g.*, Gn. 19^{11} 43^{19}, Ex. 29^{42} 33^{8} 38^{8}, Lv. 1^{5} 8^{35}, Nu. 6^{18}, Jg. 4^{20} 19^{27}), or more rarely by לפתח (Gn. 4^{7}, Nu. 11^{10}, Pr. 9^{14}), or בפתח (1 K. 4^{15}, Ezk. 11^{1}); cp. על־שערי צדיק (Pr. 14^{19}), the wicked (hang) *about* the gates of the righteous (as suppliants). Ehrlich has no ground, therefore, for his improbable suggestion that the line means lay in wait for the door (*i.e.* the wife) of my neighbour].

10. תִּטְחַן] Hfm. (with a ?) תִּטָּחֵן (*sensu obscœno*): "perhaps better," Bu. Be. But the thought is sufficiently expressed in [b]. [On the other hand, if [b] expresses this sense—and the principle that punishment should be of like kind with the sin is in favour of this—parallelism favours giving to [a] the same sense. Ehrlich, thinking even [b] too coarse, assimilates [b] to [a] by reading יכרון סחרים (cp. 40^{30}) for יכרעון אחרין, thereby getting rid of אחרין in [b] after אחר in [a].]

אחרין] see on 24^{22} (חיין).

11. היא . . . הוא] הוא, *that* (in a neuter sense), referring to the crime of [9], היא referring to זמה in [a]. "The Qrê each time needlessly assimilates the pron. to the pred." (Di.): cf. G-K. 145*u*, n. 3. [11a] is short: so Ley would prefix חֵטְא or דְּבַר to זמה, Du. would read וְסָרָה after זמה; but (Bu.) the short emphatic line may be intentional.

עָוֹן פלילים] grammatically impossible. A "Mass. compromise" (Di.) between עָוֹן פְּלִילִים and (v.[28]) עָוֹן פְּלִילִי, one or other of which must, of course, be read here. Me. Hi. Sgf. Bi. Di. read עָוֹן פלילים (Del. defends עָוֹן, as intended to guard against the immediate reference of עָוֹן to פלילים, as though these were the doers of the deed): Bu. Be. Du. read עָוֹן פלילי (so *c.* 20 MSS), as supported by [28].

12. כי אש היא וגו׳] [G-K. 155*f*.].

ובכל תבאתי תשרש] [if the text be right the בְּ is best explained not partitively as in 21[25], but as introducing the obj. regarded as the means or instrument of the action: cp. 16[4] n.; Del. compares ب in *ḳara'a bi-suwari*, he has read the suras (of the Koran). But the vb. תשרש is suspect here, partly because it does not naturally go with the subj. אש, partly because it occurs so soon again after v.[8]: hence Du. תִּשְׂרֹף].

13. No doubt the athnaḥ should stand at עבדי, the second gen. (cf. G-K. 128*a*) to משפט being separated, for the sake of the rhythm, from its *nom. regens* (Bu.); [cp. Gray, *Forms*, 78 f., for the form of parallelism. If it were necessary to make the parallelism more complete and the cstr. easier, we might read ריבָהּ for ריבם].

14. ומה] Dr. § 124.

יקום] 𝔊 (ἐὰν ἔτασίν μου ποιῆται) יִפְקֹד; so Be. But this (Bu.) "is too strong: God's rising up from his apparent inactivity and indifference to what is taking place in the world is what is meant (Ps. 3[8] al.)."

15. וַיְכֻנֶנּוּ] the sense requires the sf. of 1st pl. (־נֵנוּ), which must accordingly be read (G-K. 58*k*): [Ehrlich ־ה in reference to אמתי in [13]]; ויכוננו as it stands must be Qal; but כון (not used in Heb.) as its uses in Ph. Arab. Eth. (in which it is the common word for to *be*, weakened from to *be established* or to

subsist, show, would, if it were in use, be intrans.: a contraction from וַיְכוֹנְנֵנוּ is contrary to Heb. analogy; cp. 41[2], Is. 64[6], Jb. 17[4] [where similar errors seem to occur]: see G–K. 72*cc*; וַיְכוֹנְנֵנוּ must therefore be read (וַיְכִינֵנוּ is less suitable: see, for the Pol., in a similar connection, Dt. 32[6], Ps. 119[73]).

[בְּרחם אחד] 𝔐𝔙 rightly allows אחד, One (and the same God), to be the subj. (so 𝔗 Jer. al.); 𝔊 ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ κοιλίᾳ, 𝔖 (Symm. ἐν ὁμοίῳ τρόπῳ) = בְּרחם אחד; so Geiger (Del.), Ehrlich, Del. appealing to Gn. 41[26], for אחד used of similarity not identity.]

16. [מחפץ דלים] constr. as Nu. 24[11] מִכָּבוֹד י׳ מְנָעֲךָ, Qo. 2[10]; or מן partitive (as Nu. 11[17], Ps. 137[3]; *Lex.* 580*b*) is also possible, idiomatic, and perhaps right.

18. [גדלני . . . אנחנה] 𝔐 גְּדֵלַנִי is to be explained by G–K. 117*x* (the suffix used with the force of a dative, or sometimes of another prepositional relation, as Zec. 7[5] צַמְתֻּנִי): [so Ibn Ezra = גדל עמי]. But the constr. is harsh: and perhaps [if the meaning of 𝔐 is to be retained] אֲגַדְּלֶנּוּ (Grä. Grimme, Bu.) should be read; and, further, since the reference to the widow is not very natural, אנחנה may be an error for אנחנו (the suffix referring to the orphan); and the hyperbolical מבטן אמי could be removed by reading מב׳ אִמּוֹ. [But it is easier and yields a more satisfactory sense than 𝔐 (see exegetical n.) to point גִּדְּלַנִי (𝔗 אסניאני: cp. Rabbinic *Comm.* (ed. Wright and Hirsch) מנעורי גדלני הק׳ כאילו הוא אבי ולכך הייתי גם אני מטיב לאחרים כמוני), and to read ינחני (or נחני—Me. Bi.[1] Du. Oo. Be.[K] Vo.). 𝔊 (and so Bi.[2]) omits the entire v.; Θ ὅτι ἐκ νεότητός μου ἐξέτρεφον (גדלתי) ὡς πατήρ, καὶ ἐκ γαστρὸς μητρός μου ὡδήγησα: 𝔙 Quia ab infantia mea crevit mecum miseratio (= כְּאָב), et de utero matris meæ egressa est mecum.]

20. [אם לא] Du. ולא.

[יִתְחַמָּם] the pausal form (G–K. 54*k*).

21. [על יתום] [so 𝔊𝔐, but] the יתום has been mentioned in [17]: so Du.'s עֲלֵי־תָם [resolution of 𝔎[1]] (so Be.[K]: cf. 6[27]) may be right (Grä., before Du., had already proposed תם for יתום).

22. [מִשִּׁכְמָה] the sf. of the 3d fem. sg. pronounced lightly,

and the peculiarity protected by *Raphè* (G–K. 91*e*, where other examples are cited. So [b] קָנָה, for קָנָהּ from קָנֶה).

אזרעי] the form אֶזְרֹעַ, as Jer. 32^{21} †.

קנה] [commonly meaning *the* (hollow tube of the) *reed* (so also Assyr. *ḳanû*) occurs here only in the transferred sense of the hollow of the *socket* or *joint* into which the arm fits].

23. כי פחד אלי איד אל] (1) Di. and most, For a terror coming (אל, not ל) unto me was the calamity (*i.e.* retribution; cf. v.[3]) of God; (2) Hi. Del. (guided by Jer. 2^{19} ולא פַחְדָּתִי אליך, "and (the fact that) my terror (reached) not unto thee"), For terror (would come) unto me, (even) the calamity of God (איד אל, a "permutative" of פחד אל and (Del.) "אֵלַי = יבא (יהיה) אלי"). Of these (1) is best: in (2) the ellipse of "would come" is awkward, nor does Jer. 2^{19} *fix* the construction of the present verse. But the sense of (2) is well expressed by the emendation of Du. (so Honth. Be.[K] Bu.) כי פחד אֵל יֶאֱתֶה לִי, For the terror *of God would come unto me*; a transcriber of יאתה wrote the Aram. form יאתא (cf. Dt. 33^{21}, Is. 21^{12}), and the change of אל יאתא לי to אלי איד אל would be easy; cf. 3^{25} כי פחד פחדתי ויאתיני, 13^{11} ופחדו יפל עליכם (with ‖ שְׂאֵתוֹ). But 𝔐, as rendered by Di., is not necessarily incorrect. [But neither 𝔐 nor the emendation gives a very good parallel to [b], and אלי איד look like corrupt variants of פחד אל: possibly the original third word of the line (? עֲצָרֵנִי) has fallen out.]

24. מבטחי] with *d. f. implic.*; G–K. 95*pp*.

25. כביר] cf. 8^2 n.

26. יָקָר הֹלֵךְ] lit. moving along, as a glorious one; Bu. as a *jewel* (accus. of state, as 19^{25b}, ערום $24^{7.10}$ 27^{19}, Ru. 1^{21} al.; G–K. 118*n*). יָקָר, in its Aram. sense of *glorious*: cf. 𝔗 יַקִּיר = נִכְבָּד, Dt. 28^{58}, Is. 23^8; יְקָר, ܐܝܩܪܐ = כָּבוֹד, Ps. 8^6 24^8 al. (cf. יְקָר in Heb. = *glory*, *beauty*).

27. וַיִּפְתְּ] [so pointed in 𝔐], Qal, as Dt. 11^{16} [𝔐]: above, v.[9] (נִפְתָּה), and Jer. 20^7 (וָאֶפָּת), the Nif.

28. עון פלילי] cf. on v.[11].

כחשתי] for then *I should have* lied to: G–K. 106*p*.

29. והתעררתי] The pf. with *waw consec.* (carrying on, in

a frequentative sense, אם אשמח) with the tone held back on account of the disj. acc. (Dr. 104, 113 β). Similarly Ps. 19[14] 28[1] ונמשלתי . . . פן תחשה, Pr. 23[8] 30[9b]. 𝕿 (ויבבית) suggests והריעתי, —or, better, וְהִתְרֹעַעְתִּי (Ps. 60[10] 65[14]), which might be right.

30. נתתי לחטא חכי] = *permitted* it *to* sin: cf. Gn. 20[6], Ex. 3[19] al. (G–K. 157*b*, n.).

31. לא נשבע] נִשְׂבָּע is the Nif. ptcp.: the ptcp. negatived by לֹא, as Jer. 2[2] 18[15] (*not* Is. 62[12], cited by Del. by an oversight): Dr. 162 n., *Lex*. s.v. לֹא 2b (p. 519*b*). Du., thinking the thought of the text expressed too hyperbolically, omits יתן: Who is there unsatisfied with his flesh? נִשְׂבָּע is then, of course, the Nif. *perf*. in pause. [If the text be retained, cp. the use of מי יתן in 14[4]. The Nif. of שבע occurs only here. The line can also, of course, be rendered (AV., RVm.): Oh that we had of his flesh! we cannot be satisfied (without it); but this would be feebler, even if it were not ruled out by the fact that the men of Job's household enjoyed, and did not need to long for, this festal food. Ehrlich also takes נשבע as 1st impf. *Qal* pausal form; but his view of 𝔐 text rests on a peculiar and in some respects a very improbable treatment of other details: מתי אהלי are the *unworthy* members of Job's household; the suffix in בשרו refers to the משנאי of v.[29] (cp. the fig. use of שבע מבשר in 19[22]); not to be satisfied with any one's flesh means not to be able to take vengeance enough on him. Bi. taking נשבע in the same sense, omitting לא in both lines (cp. 𝔊) and reading בשרו for מב׳, obtains easy Hebrew, but in view of [32] a less probable meaning: Job's *servants* (𝔊 his *maid*-servants, as though reading אמהתו for מתי אהלו) never complained of not having enough to eat.]

32. לארח] Rd. with 𝔊 (παντὶ ἐλθόντι), 'Α (ὁδοιπόρῳ), 𝔖 (لأوزلا), 𝔙 (viatori), 𝕿 (לאכסניא, ξένος), Ol. Bi. Di. Bu. etc. לְאֹרֵחַ [|| גר, as Jer. 14[8]].

33. כאדם] (1) *as Adam* (𝕿 EVV. Schl. Del. Hi.); but the reference here is to concealment, not from God, but from men; (2) *as* (ordinary) *men* (Ew. Di. Dav. RVm.: cf. Ps. 82[7] אכן כְּאָדָם תמותון; also Hos. 6[7] והמה כאדם עברו ברית, where, however, the constr. may be, as men who have transgressed a

covenant); (3) Du. Be.[K] (with ?) בָּאדם, *among men*; (4) Grä. Bu. מֵאָדָם [Ehrlich וְאָדָם, a parenthesis, but Is. 26[11] is very precarious support for such a parenthesis].

לטמון] *in* hiding (G–K. 114*o*).

בחבי] חב †, as in the *Palest.* Targum, as Pr. 5[20], Ex. 4[6], 𝕿 Pr.-J.

34. כי] gives the reason for the hypothetical action כסיתי, which, as a fact, did not take place: "If I have covered . . .; Because I dreaded the great multitude, and (because) the contempt of families terrified me, So that (*lit.* and so) I kept silence, not going out of the door"; וָ in וָאֶדֹּם continuing the description of the hypothetical series of events, which did not take place (cf. Gn. 31[27], Jer. 20[17]; Dr. 74).

אערוץ] ערץ, to *dread*, as Dt. 1[29] 7[21] al.; in this sense, only here with an accus. (in another sense, it occurs so c. 13[25]).

רבה] rd. רָב (Albrecht, *ZAW*, 1895, p. 318; Bu.): המון is elsewhere always masc.

לא אצא פתח] the synchronistic (frequent.) impf.; see on 1[6]. In English one may render in such cases by a ptcp., "not going out," etc.

35–37. [In addition to various proposed translations of the existing text or emendations noticed in the exegetical notes or in the notes that follow, a brief reference may be made to some others, not that they should be accepted, but as evidence of the ambiguities of the passage, and perhaps as containing now and again fruitful suggestions in further study of what must be regarded as the unsolved problems of text and exegesis. Ehrlich reads in [35] יעננו for יענני, referring the suffix to תוי and treating ספר as a second obj. of the vb. in יעננו; in [36] אֶעֱדֶנּוּ for אענדנו; in [37] he treats אגידנו as a denom. of נגיד, and then strikes out [37b] as a gloss on אגידני: מספר צעדי is treated as adverbial acc. = wherever I go. Richter inserts before [35c] מי יתן בחן אתי = Oh that I had one to test me, and the book that my accuser has written; and in [36b] reads עטרת לְיה for עטרות לי = I would put on him a wreath as crown.]

35a. The double לי does not read well: 6 MSS, and perhaps 𝔊 (τίς δῴη ἀκούοντά μου;) 𝔖 omit (1) לי; but (2) לי would

also bear omission (see שָׁמַע in 2 S. 15[3]); and this would be better; [or, perhaps we should retain the second לִי and for לִי שמע read אֵל ישמע (|| to שדי יענני): אל would take a full stress better than לִי].

הן תוי] [S ܠܣܘܥܪܐ [ܠ ; T הא רגוני ד; V ut desiderium meam (audiat Omnipotens). G renders the whole line [35b] χεῖρα δὲ κυρίου εἰ μὴ ἐδεδοίκειν (cp. Che. in *EBi.* 2479, וישית ידו על שניגו). None of these, it will be observed, recognizes the meaning *Taw* or *mark*. What G *read* is not clear; S may have already had the reading of M, and T (whence V EV.) hardly justifies us in assuming a reading תַּאֲוָתִי (Be.[T]); תו may have been treated as = תאו (cp. Ibn Ezra, יש אמרים כי חסר א״לף), and this taken as a masc. form equivalent in meaning to תאוה. The question remains whether תאותי may be conjecturally restored; הן תאותי would give a parallel term to מי יתן in [a], and so [a] and [b] would become complete parallels; but הן תאותי is perhaps a rather heavy parallel to מי יתן. Ibn Ezra already connected תו here with the word as used in Ezk. 9[4]].

ספר כתב] [*the book which*, etc. (G–K. 155*h*). For כתב S has ܢܟܬܘܒ, V *scribat*, as if M were יכתב; G even more freely renders the whole text, συγγραφὴν δὲ ἣν εἶχον κατά τινος].

איש ריבי] the sf. referring not to ריב, but to the compound idea, איש־ריב; cf. Is. 41[11b] אנשי רִיבֶךָ, [12] אנשי מַצֻּתֶךָ; also 50[8] בעל משפטי (G–K. 135*n*). [The phrase thus means: the man who is at (legal) strife with me; cp., without the suffix and without the special legal reference (common elsewhere in ריב, *e.g.* Ex. 23[6], Dt. 21[5]), Jg. 12[2]. The meaning, the man who strives on my behalf, my advocate (שיריב בשבילי, Ibn Ezra), is indefensible: this would require רב ריבי (cp. *e.g.* Mic. 7[9], Pr. 23[11]). V ipse qui iudicat; S (transposing) ܢܣܒܘܗܝ ܒܕܝܢܐ.]

36. אענדנה] ענד, as Pr. 6[21] †.

עטרות] the pl. may be right, as referring to the several tiers of the crown; but perhaps עֲטֶרֶת (Be.[K]) or עֲטָרָה (Du.) should be read.

37. אגידנו] for אגיד לו (G–K. 117*x*): the double accus. after הגיד is dubious (see on 26[4]). Du. אַגִּיד (without sf.).

אקרבנו] I would *bring it near* (Is. 41[21] קָרְבוּ רִיבְכֶם), *present*

it, *sc.* unto him (Ges. Me. Bu. RVm.), or (Du.) I *would let him* (my adversary) *draw near* (Ps. 65[5], Jer. 30[21]), *receive him*, proudly confident that he could not convict me. EVV. Di. Del. al. as intensive of Qal, expressing (Di.) a firm and dignified movement, I would *draw near* unto him; but Ezk. 36[8] קָרְבוּ לָבוֹא is not proof of the intrans. sense of קֵרֵב (cf. the trans. Pi. in such cases, מִהַר לִמְצֹא, כַּלֵּה ל); and אֲקָרְבֶנּוּ cannot naturally mean anything but *bring it* (or *him*) *near*.

39. נפש בעליה הפחתי] [there is a curious difference between ancient and almost all modern interpretations of the verbal phrase; the ancient interpretation is: *I have grieved*; the modern, *I have caused to expire*. 𝔊 εἰ δὲ καὶ ψυχὴν κυρίου τῆς γῆς ἐκλαβὼν ἐλύπησα; 𝔖 ܐܢ (? read ܕܡܟܝܢܐ) ܘܢܦܫܐ ܕܡܟܝ̈ܢܐ ܐܕܘܠ; 𝔗 ונפש דמרהא אפחית (on the meaning, see below); 𝔙 et animam agricolarum eius afflixi; so Wycliffe, Seb. Münster. The modern interpretation is already established in AV., and appears in most modern comm. and translations; exceptions are Me. Wr. ("have disregarded the life of its occupier"), Honth. ("dem Bauer drauf die Seele ausgepresst"), Ehrlich. The Hif. הפח occurs in Mal. 1[13] † with a different sense: here it obviously expresses the causative of the idea in מפח נפש, 11[20], and נפחה נפשה, Jer. 15[9]. In 11[20] death might be, and is commonly taken to be, intended; but in Jer. 15[9] it is used in reference to sensations, "figuratively of mental collapse at the death of her sons in battle" (Dr.); so in late Hebr. and Aramaic the vb. or noun is sometimes clearly used of something short of death—despondency, vexation, despair, or the like; cp. especially הלך לו במפח נפש, he went away vexed (Tanchuma cited by Levy, *ChWB* ii. 59*b*), and similarly בפחי נפש, *Rosh hashshana*, 2[6]; note also לאפחא ית נפשך, 1 S. 2[33]. 𝔗 (= לאריב את נ'), מפחת נפש = ראבן נפש, Dt. 28[65]. The idioms refer to the *breathing* (out), or *blowing* (away) of the soul; but this need not necessarily imply death, since Hebrew thought contemplated the departure of the soul from the body, not only at death, but also, *e.g.*, when a man is faint for lack of food (La. 1[11]). The phrase הפח נפש might, therefore, denote the opposite treatment to that which brings back the soul; *i.e.* to sadden or grieve as contrasted with to comfort or alleviate

(Ru. 4^{15}); and this would give an excellent parallel, *if* בעליה could mean the labourers on Job's farms (𝔙, Honth.); but this is improbable. Unless בעליה be corrupt, the person or persons concerned must be, in one sense or another, the owner(s) of the land].

באשה †] [seems to be more general than באשים, Is. $5^{2.4}$ †: weeds, rather than a particular kind of weed (EV. "cockle"), especially, perhaps, rank-smelling (cp. באש, הבאיש) weeds].

CHAPTER XXXII.

1. [האלה] MS [Ken. 76] om.; cp. v.[5]. On 𝔊 see exegetical n.

[בעיניו] MS [Ken. 248] בעיניהם; so 𝔖𝔊: cp. Σ ἐπ' αὐτῶν, Geiger, *Urschrift*, 332 f. But "he *had become* (during the course of the debate) righteous in *their* eyes," would have required היה rather than הוא; cp. *e.g.* Gn. 27^{28}.

2. [בַּרַכְאֵל] 𝔊 *Βαραχιηλ*. Olsh. (277^{5}) treats the verbal element as imp^{v}. (but see *HPN* 221): Bless, O God. Yet, as probably in Phœn. ברכבעל, Palm. בול ברך, the verbal element may be pf.: if ברכיה = יברכיה (*HPN* 216 n.), it might even be impf. (Du.).

[הבוזי ממשפחת רם] cp. ובת משפחות יחתני ואדם 31^{34} (Hoffm.). For רם 𝔊 has 'Ραμ ('Ραμα, 'Αραμ), τῆς Αὐσείτιδος χώρας, Σ Συρίας, 𝔗 אברהם, 𝔖 ܪܡܐ.

[צִדְּקוֹ] to *prove*, or *consider* (some one) *to be in the right* is expressed here, as in 33^{32} (𝔐), Jer. 3^{11} (𝔐), Ezk. $16^{51f.}$ (𝔐), by the Piel, but in 27^{5} by the Hif.

[מאלהים] מן *rather than* as Jer. 3^{11} (cp. c. 40^{8}); 𝔊 *before* as 4^{17}, but less suitably to the present context.

3. [מענה] v.[5]: *answer* is expressed by תשובה in 21^{34}, and also 34^{36} (Elihu), or, substantially, by מלין in 8^{10}, and also 33^{32} 36^{2}, מלתי in 13^{17}, מלין יענני in 23^{5}.

[וירשיעו את איוב] either (1) *and* (yet) *condemned Job*, waw conv. as, *e.g.*, 2 S. 19^{29} (Dr. §§ 74, 79); or (2) *and* (therefore) *condemned not Job*, the force of the לא extending from לא מצאו to the following vb. with waw conv. as in 3^{10} (n.). If לא מצאו means *they* (now) *found no* (further) *answer* (cp. v.[5]), the second rendering is best; leaving Job with the last word, they were virtually leaving him uncondemned. The same sense would be secured if εὐσεβῆ(ν) in [A* ℵ* HP23], 𝔖 [H] (ܡܚܝܒ ܠܐ ܠܐܝܘܒ)

were the true reading of 𝔊 (not ἀσεβῆ of most MSS), and this pointed to ויצדיקו instead of וירשיעו. According to a Jewish tradition (תקון סופרים) איוב is a correction for אלהים, and the original text ran: *because they found no answer* (to Job), *and so condemned God.*

4. ואליהוא חכה את איוב בדברים] awkward even for the poor style of these vv. Hos. 6[9] is a precarious parallel for חכה (usually construed with ל) with the acc. It is questionable whether 𝔊's ὑπέμεινεν δοῦναι ἀπόκρισιν Ἰὼβ is more than a paraphrase of 𝔐; the similar rendering of RV., "Waited to speak unto Job," is certainly a paraphrase; Du., however, at the suggestion of 𝔊, inclines to insert להשיב before את־איוב: most, following Wr., read בְּדַבְּרָם את איוב: (waited) *while, or so long as, they spoke with Job.* Ehrlich, also reading and pointing בְּדַבְּרָם, but not transposing: (waited) *with,* or *beside, Job while they spoke.* Hi. inserts רעי between את and איוב. For חכה Σ has ἔπληξε (= הכה), and 𝔖 ܡܚܐ (= הִכָּה): both unsuitable in the context.

6. וַיֹּאמַר] see 3[2] n.

לימים] cf. on 30[1]. The addition is not otiose, and, here, needed for the rhythm (cf. 15[10] כביר מאביך ימים).

וישישים] see 12[12] n. Du. *m. c.* inserts, after ישישים, עֲלֵכֶם (which might rather easily have dropped out before על כן).

וחלתי] either [(1) *I held back* (RV. Bu.), the root being זחל = زحل = ܙܚܠ, *to withdraw,* which occurs in Heb. only in the phrases זחלי עפר, Dt. 32[24], ז' ארץ, Mic. 7[17], used of reptiles that "crawl away to hide themselves under stones, plants," etc. (Dr. *Deut., ad loc.*); or, more probably, (2) *I was in dread* (Hi. Du.) from זחל = ذحل = ܕܚܠ; this does not occur elsewhere in OT., but it is found in the old Aramaic inscription of Zakir, king of Hamath (9th cent. B.C.), who records that Baal Shamain said to him [אל תזחל כי אנה . . . עמך ואנה אהצלך מן כל מל[כיא (A 13), *be not afraid, for I . . . am with thee,* etc., and is common in later Aramaic with the regular substitution of *d* for the *z* of old Aramaic. In Arabic the same root survives in ذَحْل, *blood-revenge*; see Nö. in *ZDMG* xl. 741, liv. 163. 𝔊, guessing, ἡσύχασα].

מְחַוּוֹת] חַוֵּה Aram. for הגיד: vv.[10. 17] (as here with דֵּעַ), 15^{17} 36^{2}, Ps. 19^{3} †; cf. the subst. אחותי, 13^{17} (n.).

דעי] דֵּעַ (masc. of דֵּעָה or דֵּעת) vv.[10. 17] $36^{3.4}$ (דֵּעוֹת) 37^{16} (דֵּעִים) †.

אֶתְכֶם] [For the double acc. after חוה, cp. the similar construction with הגיד in 26^{4}; but see n.]. Bu. Be., perhaps, אִתְּכֶם.

7. ידיעו] the pl. by attraction, as 15^{20}. [Read defectively (ידעו) by 𝔊, and treated as Qal: the ‖ favours 𝔐.]

8. אכן] a strong asseverative, often used to introduce emphatically the statement of a *fact*, after what had been, mistakenly "said" or thought (Zeph. 3^{7}, Jer. 3^{20} 8^{8}, Is. 49^{4} 53^{4}, Ps. 31^{23} 82^{7}; *Lex.* 38*b*). [Here only in Job.]

רוח היא באנוש ונשמת שדי תבינם] [The syntax of the v. is best explained as follows: רוח is pred., תבינם, a noun sentence, is the subj., and היא is an anticipation of the subject, as is הוא in La. 1^{18}, הנה in Is. 51^{19}, הם in Pr. 30^{24} (cp. Dr. § 201 (1)). The pred. רוח is doubly qualified: it is the רוח *of the Almighty*, and it is that רוח *entering into* (ב), or imparted to, *man*; in prose these two qualifications would stand in a single clause רוח שדי באנוש, but the requirements of parallelism and rhythm call for two parallel terms (נשמה and רוח), and distribute the qualifying clauses between the two lines. To insert אל after רוח (Bi. Bu.), cp. 33^{4} 𝔐, and πνεῦμα θεοῦ (Σ here) rhythmically overloads the line; to substitute אל for היא would make line ᵃ an easy sentence but an irrelevant assertion; irrelevancy is the objection also to RV. "there is a spirit in man"; though syntactically this is possible. Du., dissatisfied with all explanations of 𝔐, proposes תאיר אנוש for היא באנוש, and renders: the Spirit (viz. of God) enlightens man].

9. לא רבים] can mean naturally only "not many," or, less obviously, "not great men" (EVV.). Di. Hi. De. take *grandes* in the sense of *grandævi*, but it is doubtful whether רב,—and especially רבים,—standing alone, would have this sense unless clearly suggested by the context, as by the antithesis of צעיר in Gn. 25^{23} ורב יעבד צעיר (but Bu. even here would render, *the greater*); Bu. Be.[T] לא שָׂבִים (15^{10}), a neat change, 𝔊 πολυχρόνιοι, 𝔖 ܡܣܓܝܐܝ̈ ܫܢ̈ܝܐ, 𝔙 *longævi*, whence

Ley לא רַבֵּי ימים, Du. Be.^{T}, better, לא רֹב יָמִים (note 𝔖; and cf. ^{7} רֹב שנים).

10–17. [Vv.$^{12. 15. 16. 17}$ (except for a fragment, see below) and the words עד תחקרון מלין in ^{11} are absent from 𝔎^{1}, and were absent from the original text of 𝔊, their place being subsequently supplied from Θ. But this, as Be. points out, does not justify the inference (Bi.) that $^{15-17}$ (Hatch omits $^{11-17}$) were absent from the original text of 𝔐; on the other hand, *πάλιν λαλήσω*, at the beginning of ^{18} = עוד in ^{16b} + אענה in ^{17a}, and represents an abbreviation by 𝔊 of a text that need not have been very different from the existing text of 𝔐. Even if this text is in some disorder, 𝔊 is of little use as a guide to reaching a more primitive text. V.^{10b} is repeated at ^{17b}, and in ^{17} forms an exact formal parallel to ^{17a}; so that if the repetition is not original, it may be ^{10b} rather than ^{17b} that is intrusive. Of proposed reconstructions Du.'s would be preferable to Bu.'s, if either were needed: Du. omits v.^{10} (except לכן) and reads the rest in the order ^{9}, לכן of ^{10} + ^{15}, $^{16. 17. 11a. b. 12a. 11c. 12b. c. 13. 14. 18}$; Bu. omits $^{11. 12. 15-17}$, and reads the remainder in the order $^{9. 13. 14. 10}$. Bu. treats ^{11} and ^{12} as tristichs, as which they would stand apart from the surrounding distichs; ^{11} might well be a tristich, ^{12} less naturally; at the same time, even when transposed (as by Du.), $^{12a. 11c}$ do not form a very happy distich, nor one that is rhythmically beyond reproach; this might be due to these lines being glosses, or to some other textual disorder at this point.]

10. שמעה] 2 MSS, 𝔊𝔖𝔙 שמעו: so Hi. Bu. Be.^{T}. This agrees with the fact that Elihu is here addressing the friends (vv.$^{6. 11 ff.}$): still Di. (though he allows that this "im Grunde besser passt") points out that he has Job distinctly in mind (cf. 33^{1}), that it is "at least not impossible" that at the end of a paragraph he might invite him particularly to attend, and that the correction of שמעה into שמעו is easier to understand than the opposite change.

אף] frequent in Elihu (Bu.); [see $34^{12. 17}$ 35^{14} 36^{16} $37^{1. 11}$].

11. הוחלתי] the Hif. also v.^{16}: elsewhere in the book the Pi. יִחֵל.

אָזִין] contracted from אַאֲזִין which is read by 5 MSS Ken.; cf. וַיָּאצֶל, Nu. 11^{25} (G–K. 68*i*).

עַד] different from אֶל or לְ, and implying not listening *to* something *present*, but (Bu.) "listening eagerly *for* something *expected*": I listened *even unto* your reasons, *until* your reasons came (cf. c): "listened *for*" (EVV.) is adequate in English.

תבונותיכם] *your understandings*, *i.e.* words or speeches in which your understanding would declare itself: EVV. *reasons* is a fair paraphrase.

12. וְעָדֵיכֶם] with counter-tone for וַעֲדֵיכֶם [G–K. 103*o*]. עד itself is peculiar (for 38^{18} is not parallel),—probably (Di.) as in 11.

אין לאיוב מוכיח] [cp. אין לו מקים, Jer. 50^{32}; אין לי מכיר, Ps. 142^{5}; אין לה מנחם, La. 1^{2} (9. 17 א' מ' לה); אין משיע לה, Dt. 22^{27}; דרש אין לה, Jer. 30^{17}. In these cases ל does not introduce the obj. of the part.—for an emphatic *prefixing* of the obj. there would be no reason—but goes closely with the אין, as obviously when אין negatives a noun (*e.g.* Gn. 11^{30}); cp. *Lex.* *s.v.* אין 3. With the מ in b (מכם) after אין ל, cp. La. 1^{2}].

13. פן] = (Beware), *lest*, as 36^{18}, Is. 36^{18}.

ידפנו] *drive him away*. 1 MS ירדפנו, *pursue him* (so Grä.); 1 MS יהדפנו, *thrust away* (2 K. 4^{27}).

[14. ולא ערך אלי מלין ובאמריכם לא אשיבנו] The connection between the two lines, and of both with what precedes, is not clearly marked, and has been differently explained. Bu., *e.g.*, says "the meaning is: his weapons can do *me* no harm, for my (weapons) are different from yours"; on this view v.14a is antithetical to the sense of what precedes, viz., that Job has silenced and thereby got the better of the friends, and 14b is a reason for 14a; but neither the antithesis nor the reason is clearly expressed: on Bu.'s view we should expect at least to find אלי prefixed to לא ערך, כי instead of ו before באמריכם, and יערך impf. for ערך pf. Similar objections lie against other explanations of 𝔐. The presence of the parallel terms מלין and (ו ב)אמרי(כם)—at the end of the first and beginning of the second lines respectively (cp. Gray, *Forms of Hebrew Poetry*, p. 67 f.)—suggest that the lines were originally

more exact parallels than in 𝔐; if they were, לא ערך conceals a parallel to לא אשיבנו, and אלי, perhaps, to כם—in ובאמריכם. As a matter of fact these concealed parallels reappear, if we assume the loss of two letters (one perhaps later than 𝔊) by haplography, and the mutilation (also perhaps later than 𝔊) of ה into י; read כָּאֵלֶּה (or לֹא־אֶעֱרֹךְ, Bi.) לא אֶעֱרֹךְ for לא ערך אלי: τοιαῦτα, in 𝔊's paraphrastic rendering of [14a] ([14b] is omitted in 𝔊) ἐπετρέψατε λαλῆσαι τοιαῦτα ῥήματα, is, of course, the exact equivalent of כאלה; cp. τοιαῦτα πολλά = כאלה רבות in 16^2; the weight of 𝔊's support for כאלה would be greater but for a tendency of the version to insert τοιαῦτα (*after* the noun, however, and not as here and in 16^2 before) when it was certainly not in its Hebrew text: see $15^{4.13}$ 33^{16}, and cp. 39^{14} ($=40^4$), but not 8^{18}, where τοιαῦτα = כ (at the end of v.[17]) and הן (at the beginning of v.[18]).]

ולא] 𝔖𝔙 omit the וְ; whether it was in the text paraphrased (see last n.) by 𝔊 is quite uncertain.

15. העתיקו] the "internal" Hif., with a (virtually) intrans. sense (G–K. 53*d*), as Gn. 12^8 26^{22}. 𝔊 (Θ) ἐπαλαίωσαν ἐξ αὐτῶν λόγους (from the sense of עתק in 21^7, and in Aram.).

16. והוחלתי] Ew. Hi. De. Di. Du.: And should I wait (וְהוֹחַלְתִּי) because they speak not? for the ו consec. with the pf. introducing a question, see Dr. 119*γ*, G–K. 112*cc*: cf. Ezk. $18^{13.24}$, Nu. 16^{16}, Is. 66^9 וַעֲצַרְתִּי, and Ps. 50^{21} והחרשתי (Dr. 104). As Bu. observes, as the emphasis rests on the speaker, ואני אוחיל would be expected; but "And I waited" (והוחלתי, with simple *waw*), etc., yields a very poor sense, besides equally needing the emphatic pron. (ואני הוחלתי). It may be noticed, however, that the emphatic pron. follows (twice) in [17]. [Ehrlich והחלותי, *and so I begin*; but the אני would still be as much missed.]

17. אַעֲנֶה] the punctuation as Hif. (Qoh. 5^{19}†, where the מ' in מַעֲנֶה is probably dittographed) is very strange: probably אֶעֱנֶה חלקי was avoided, as the construction was felt to be awkward, and אַעֲנֶה חלקי was intended to mean, "I will *make* my part *answer*." Ew. conjectured (§ 192*c*, n. 2) that it was a proverbial saying, meaning (הֶעֱנָה, a denom. from מענה, a

furrow[1]) "I also will *furrow* my own field!" fig. for, do the part that belongs to me. The explanation is clever, and might well be right, but it is precarious. If אענה means ***will answer***, אֲעַנֶּה must be read.

חלקי] acc. of reference, ***as regards*** my part: Gn. [41^{40}] (G–K. [118*h*]); or a kind of cogn. acc.? or, answer my part (respond to its call)? [or, rather, so the parallelism suggests, ***make reply with my portion*** (cp. 15^{2} n.): see exegetical n.]. Ehrlich לִקְחִי—excellently, if emendation is necessary.

18. כי] The line is somewhat short: hence Ley כי פִי מלאתי, Be.[K] אנכי for כי, Du. either אנכי or כי אני.

מלתי] for מלאתי (so *c.* 20 MSS): cf. 1^{21} יָצָתִי (G–K. 23*f*, 74*k*).

19. הנה] Bi. Ley, Be.[K] *m. c.* הֵן.

יבקע] the tense is expressive (Dr. § 37 ff.): EVV., excellently, "*is ready to* burst." As regards the syntax, בטני "is conceived as its gramm. obj. on the principle of 22^{9}" (Di. Bu. G–K. 121*b*), or (Du.) יבקע may be a clerical error for תִּבָּקַע, due to the preceding יפתח; so Bu. (alt.) Be.[K], 𝕲 *ὥσπερ φυσητὴρ χαλκέως* (as though כאבות חָרָשִׁים); 𝕾 ܐܝܟ ܙܩܐ ܕܢܦܚܐ (as though (Be.) כְּאֹבוֹת חָרָשִׁים!).

20. וירוח לי] 1 S. 16^{23}† וְרָוַח לשאול: cf. רֶוַח, Est. 4^{14}; רְוָחָה, Ex. 8^{11}, La. 3^{56}, + Ps. 66^{12} (for רְוָיָה).

21. ואֶל־אדם] MS [507] (de Rossi) וְאֵל for וְאֶל, *i.e.* and unto God, being a man, I will not use fair titles; but the form of the Hebrew is improbable. Be.[K] (with a ?) ואף אֵל for ואל אדם.

אכנה] [22], Is. 44^{5} 45^{4}†.

22. כי לא ידעתי אכנה] The constr. of the impf. is more Syriac than Hebrew: see Dr. 163, *Obs.*; G–K. 120*c*; Nöld. *Syr. Gr.* § 267. Cf. Is. 42^{21} חפץ ... יאדיר, 47^{5}, La. 4^{14}. [Richter כי לו אֶל רֵעַי אכנה, and in [b] יִשָּׂשֵׂנִי for ישאני.]

[כמעט] cp. Ps. 2^{12} 81^{15}.]

[1] ["On מענה, the furrow (cp. Ps. 129^{3}), at the end of which the ploughman turns, see Dalman, *ZDPV*, 1905, p. 27 ff. . . مَعْنًا still means a furrow in Palestine" (Dr. *Samuel*[2], p. 109, on 1 S. 14^{14}). Cp. *Ohal.* 17^{2} (cited by Levy, *s.v.*) חרש חצי מענה, if any one has ploughed the half of his furrow.]

CHAPTER XXXIII.

1. ואולם] *Howbeit*, "breaking off, and turning aside to a new subject, as 14^{18}" (Di.). [אלם, common to the Prologue, the Dialogue, and Elihu, is a favourite word in Job (1^{11} 11^{5} 12^{7} 13^{4} 14^{18} 17^{10} with ו as here, and 2^{5} 5^{8} 13^{3}† without), occurring in this book as frequently as in the whole of the rest of the OT.]

2. הנה נא] as 13^{18} $40^{15ff.}$; *Lex.* 609*b*.

[בחכי] חך, strictly the palate or roof of the mouth, is here used in synonymous parallelism to פי, as in Pr. 5^{3} 8^{7} to שפתים, in reference to speech: cp. also 31^{30}.]

3. My words are (= embody) the honesty of my heart, And the knowledge of my lips they utter purely or sincerely (adv. acc.; or, *as something pure* or sincere). Cf. שפה ברורה, Zf. 3^{9}. Be. Du. לבי אמרי דָעַת שפתי ברור מללו (Du. יָשִׁק) רָחַשׁ, My heart *is astir* (Du. overflows) with words of knowledge, My lips speak that which is pure: רחש, as Ps. 45^{2}; יָשִׁק, as Jl. 2^{24}, הֵשִׁיקוּ היקבים תירוש ויצהר, 4^{13}. רחש is excellent (Ps. 45^{2}); but it deviates much more from 𝕳 than יָשִׁק. Either Be. or Du. give a couplet superior stylistically to 𝕳: but the loss of ישר is considerable. 𝕾 om. דעת, so Grimme, St. (keeping ᵃ as 𝕸), "And my lips speak that which is pure"; but it is not clear that 𝕾 did not *read* דעת, a strictly *verbal* rendering may not have been intended.

5. השיבני] see on 13^{22}. [ᵃ is rather short: 𝕾 + [illegible] (ct. v.^{32}), which does not necessarily imply that דבר was read, for cp. 13^{22} 𝕾. 𝕲 + πρὸς ταῦτα, whence Du. אלה, Ley על־זאת, Nichols לזאת.]

ערכה] מלין (32^{14}) or משפט (23^{4}) might be supplied; but התיצבה suggests (Del. Bu.) that מלחמה is in the poet's mind:

ערך with ellipse of מלחמה is not unfrequent (*Lex.* p. 789*b*); probably, indeed, the word is intended to suggest both ideas.

התיצבה] in a military sense, as 1 S. 17^{16}, 2 S. 23^{12}.

6. כפיך] כְּפִי, as [Ex. 16^{21} כפי אכלו, each *in proportion to* his eating; so here lit. I am *in the proportion of* thee as regards God, *i.e.* I stand towards God even as thou dost (*Lex.* 805*b*)] Grä. St. כָּמוֹךָ.

לאל] [Be.^{K} (?), Ehrlich לא אֵל].

קֹרַצְתִּי] In NH. קרץ is used of a baker *cutting* off pieces of dough, or of cutting off grapes in a lump with the cluster (*NHWB* iv. 388*a*).

7. אַכְפִּי] from אֶכֶף†: cf. the vb. Pr. 16^{26} נפש עָמֵל עמלה לו כי אָכַף עליו פיהו. The √ is common in Syr. [and Jewish Aramaic, cp. מה איכפת ליה, *What does it matter to him? What concern is it of his?* examples in *NHWB* i. 77*b*, 78*a*. ܟܦܐ ܠܗ; ܠܐ; Pr. 6^7, 𝔖, *there is no one to urge*, or *compel*, *him*: ܠܐ ܐܟܦܐ ܘܠܐ ܗܘܐ = οὐκ ἀνάγκη λέγειν νῦν (these and other examples in PS. 189*a*). Thus *urgency* rather than *pressure* (RV.) should be the force of אכף]. 𝔊 ἡ χείρ μου = כַּפִּי (cf. 13^{21}): so Ol. Hi. Wr. Hfm. Sgf. Be. Bu. Du.,—with, naturally, תכבד (Be. Sgf. Bu. Du.). But the Aramaism may well be original: the other words of 13^{21a} are not quoted exactly.

8. מלין] מליך would be more natural (Bi. Bu. Du. Be.), though not (Bu.) exactly necessary. 𝔊$^{K, A}$ 𝔖 express the pron.; but the case is not one in which we can be sure that they *read* it. EVV. insert "thy" in italics.

9. בלי פשע] [For בלי with a noun (*without* . . .) forming a negative clause synonymous in meaning with a preceding adj., see 24^{10}, Ps. 63^2].

חַף†] an Aramaism, from the √ ܚܦ, ܚܦ (rare), to *rub* or *cleanse*, especially the head.

10. הן] Oo. Be.^{K} הוא.

תנואות] Nu. 14^{34}†. הניא is to *frustrate* or *thwart* a purpose, Ps. 33^{10}; to *annul* or *disallow* a vow, Nu. 30^6: so תנואה in Nu. 14^{34} (וידעתם את־תנואתי) is my *frustration* (*sc.* of your purpose; RV. paraphrasing *my alienation*); and here תנואות

are *frustrations*, *i.e.* vexatious interferences with my plans (cf. 17[11]). But it is highly probable that תֹּאֲנוֹת should be read (so Wr. Bu. Du. Be. Barth), i.e. *occasions* or *opportunities* (viz. of hostility), from אִנָּה (Arab. *'anā'*, to *come at the right time*), to *bring at the right time*, or *opportunely*, Ex. 21[13] והאלהים אִנָּה לידו; Hithp. to *make an opportunity for oneself*, seek a quarrel, 2 K. 5[7] כי מִתְאַנֶּה הוא לי; Jg. 14[4] כי תֹאֲנָה הוא מבקש מפלשתים. This sense is already expressed by 𝔖 (ܥܶܠܠܬܳܐ).

11. וישׂם] point יָשֵׂם: see on 13[27].

בסד] See on 13[27]. [V.[11] (Bi. Du. om.), like [10b] from 13[24], is cited verbatim, except for the necessary changes in the persons, from 13[27]: ct. [9. 10a] which summarize some of Job's charges, but with new terms (תנואות, חק).]

12. זאת] acc. of respect, "*as regards* this," Anglicè, "*in* this": so (with זאת) 19[26] (si vera l.), Ezk. 20[27]†. Ew. Di. Del., and in effect RVm. "'Behold, in this thou art not in the right,' (so) I answer thee"; but the parenthetical אענך is un-Hebraic (though, cf. Ex. 5[16] אֹמְרִים). RVm. "Behold, in this thou art not just, I will answer thee"; but no answer to the complaints made by Job follows. [אענך is thus, probably, corrupt: possibly it is a variant of (לא)יענה in [13]: 𝔊 in both vv. has οὐκ ἐπακήκοέν μου· Still the simple omission of אענך would leave [12a] rhythmically rather deficient.] 𝔊 πῶς γὰρ λέγεις, Δικαιός εἰμι καὶ οὐκ ἐπακήκοέν μου; whence Bi.[1] הן זאת צדקתי (Bi.[2] צעקתי) ולא יענני (with the reading צעקתי, cf. 19[7] 30[20]); Du. הנה אם אצעק לא עָנָה, Behold, if I cried, he would not answer (? יַעֲנֶה); Be.[K] הֵךְ תאמר צדקתי ולא אֱעָנֶה (ולא אענה), as 19[7]; הֵיךְ, as [1 Ch. 13[12] (‖ איך, 2 S. 6[9]), Dn. 10[17]†)]. Of these Be.[K] has the advantage of adhering most closely to 𝔊; but תאמר for זאת and the transposition of לא are both violent changes.

כי ירבה אלוה מאנוש] רבה in the sense of to *be great* [occurs here only in reference to persons: of things, Gn. 43[34]. The כי is commonly taken to be causal: it might introduce the explication of זאת (pointing forward as in 10[13]), if the following clause were suitable: this it is not in 𝔐, for we cannot translate 𝔐 with Ehrlich, that God acts too severely against men. But ירבה may be corrupt]. 𝔊 αἰώνιος (apparently =

(מֵעֲלָם) γάρ ἐστιν ὁ ἐπάνω (apparently עליון for אלוה) βροτῶν, whence Du. מַעְלִם for כי ירבה, God *hideth* (his eyes) from men (מַעְלִם with ellipse of עיניו, as Ps. 10^1). But the change is very violent, besides being, in fact, not necessary.

13. רִיבוֹתָ] G-K. 73.

כי כל דבריו לא יענה] The older renderings, "For he giveth not account of any of his matters" (AV., RV.), "is not responsible for" (Ges. Del.[1]), are inconsistent with the meaning of עָנָה; "all his words he answereth not" (= answereth not a single word) (Schl. Kamph.) presupposes (Di.) דָּבָר for דבריו. 𝔐 can only be rendered (Del.[2]), That he answereth not any of his (man's, v.[12]) words (appeals): but, as Job is the only man of whose treatment by God Job complains (19^7 30^{20}), it is both more pointed and far more natural to read for דבריו either דבריך (Hi. Di. Sgf. Bu. Be.), or, following 𝔊's paraphrase (λέγεις δέ, Διὰ τί τῆς δίκης μου οὐκ ἐπακήκοέν μου πᾶν ῥῆμα;) דברי, with כי introducing the direct narration, G-K. 157*b* (Bi. Du. Be. alt.).

14. באחת . . . בשתים] *in one way . . . in two ways;* EVV. *once . . . twice*; but, as Del. points out, *once* is אחת and *twice* שתים, 2 K. 6^{10}, Ps. 62^{12} [also c. 40^5], and באחת is never = בפעם אחת.

ובשתים לא ישורנה] שור, as 35^{13}; see also 7^8 17^{15} 20^9 24^{15} 34^{29} $35^{5.14}$: לא ישורנה = *without* . . . Dr. § 162. Sgf. Bu. St. לא תשורנה, And in two, without *thy* perceiving it; Grä. לא ישמענה, And in two, without his hearing it; 𝔖 (ܡܬܢܐ ܠܐ), 𝔙 (repetit), whence Mich. Be.[T. K] לא ישנה (or Be.[T] לא ישננה), And in two he *doth not repeat it*,—but this disagrees with the sequel (in which God is said to speak in more than one way); Du. Be.[K] alt. (cf. Σ οὐκ ἀκυρώσει αὐτόν) לא ישיבנה, And in two he *doth not reverse it* (viz. what he has said, his teaching, warning). [Ley, Peake אם לא ישורנה.]

15. חזיון] 6 MSS, and perhaps 𝔖𝔙 (𝔊 also has ἐν), בחזיון. 𝔊 ἢ ἐν μελέτῃ = בהגיון.

בנפל תרדמה על אנשים] = 4^{13b}: here probably a gloss from 4^{13b} (Bi. Du. Be. Bu. St.): notice (Du.) the recurrence of אנשים in [16a].

16. ובמסרם יחתם] [both words are very ambiguous: the

vb. may be (1) יַחְתֹּם (𝔐), *seals*, *i.e.* impresses a seal on, or perhaps, metaphorically, *concludes*: cp. especially the Arabic in, *e.g.*, ختم القران, he concluded (the reading of) the Qoran, خاتم النبيين, the seal, *i.e.* the last, of the prophets: or (2) יְחִתֵּם (𝔊: see below), *dismays them*; the prep. ב may be *by means of* (after יְחִתֵּם), or it may introduce the obj. of יַחְתֹּם (though for this 37^7 gives only a precarious support). מסרם, which 𝔐 supplies with what is probably a conflate punctuation (מֹסָרָם), may be (1) מֹסְרָם *their fetter* (12^{18} n.), which may be indicated by 𝔐's מֹ (the *scriptio defectiva* being then as in 39^5) instead of מָ; or (2) מֻסָרָם (so 1 MS, de Rossi), *their discipline* (*i.e.* the discipline imparted to them), which may be indicated by 𝔐's סָ instead of סֵ, which would have been required for the meaning fetter; or (3) מֻסָרִם, *disciplines, admonishments*, though the pl. does not occur elsewhere. If the noun be מֻסָר, does it mean discipline in the sense of suffering (Di. Ehrlich; cp. the Mishnic יסורין), or disciplinary *instruction*, or *warnings* (Bu. Dr.)? In favour of the latter is 36^{10}, where the parallel strongly suggests that מוסר is something *spoken* to man, not something suffered by him; and it is against the former that the method of instruction through suffering is first developed from v.[19] onwards]. 𝔊 *ἐν εἴδεσιν φόβου τοιούτοις αὐτοὺς ἐξεφόβησεν* (*Ἀ πλήξει αὐτούς*: 𝔖 ܢܡܟܟ ܐܢܘܢ); whence for יַחְתֹּם, Wr. Bi. Hfm. Bu. Du. Be יְחִתֵּם: Du. Be. also, for מוסרם, מוֹרָאִים (Dt. 4^{34}): Be. alt. בְּמַעֲרָצִים, but *ἐν εἴδεσιν* corresponds rather to מַרְאִים, *visions*. [Perhaps we have in *εἴδεσιν φόβου* traces of a double rendering of מַרְאִים: (1) *εἴδεσιν*, (2) *φόβοις*; for *τοιούτοις*, see n. on 32^{14}. Nichols, after 𝔊, במראי מורים.]

17. להסיר אדם מעשה] Rd. after 𝔊 (*ἀπὸ ἀδικίας*), 𝔖 (ܡܢ ܥܒ̈ܕܘܗܝ), 𝔙 (ab his quae fecit), 𝔗 (מִן עובדא) מִמַּעֲשֵׂהוּ: so virtually EVV. (*from his* in italics), Di. al., מעשה being understood from the context (cf. פָּעֳלָם, 36^9) to be an *evil* deed (*facinus*). Bi. Du., following 𝔊 more closely, מֵעַוְלָה; but (Bu.) *ἀδικία* may be only an explanation of מעשה. Be. either מֵעֹשֶׁק, or מִפֶּשַׁע, or מִמַּעֲשֵׂהוּ. [Ehrlich quite differently: להסתיר מאדם מעשהו, retaining [b] unchanged.]

וגוה מגבר יכסה] גֵּוָה, the Aram. form [as, *e.g.*, in Dn. 4[34], 𝔗 Is. 3[27]] for גַּאֲוָה, as 22[29], Jer. 13[17]; יכסה . . . לְהָסִיר, as Is. 10[2] and often, Dr. § 118. To *hide* pride from man yields, however, a poor and doubtful sense: to *hide* is not = to *withdraw, wean from* (Del.). Hence Di. Du. Be.[K] (as an alternative, see below) יְכַלֶּה; Reiske, Bi.[2] Bu. Du. alt. יְכַסֵּחַ, *cut away* (as with a knife or sickle; Is. 33[12] קוֹצִים כְּסוּחִים, Ps. 80[17] † כְּסוּחָה, of a vine). 𝔊 τὸ δὲ σῶμα αὐτοῦ (= גֵּוֹה (20[25] n.): so also 𝔖 ܘܡܢ ܡܦܘܠܬܗ) ἀπὸ πτώματος ἐρρύσατο; hence Bi.[1] גֵּוֹה מִשֶּׁבֶר יפצה (פְּצָה, to *rescue* (Aram.), as Ps. 144[7]); so Be.[K] (as an alternative), with יְפַדֶּה alternative for יִפְצֶה.

18. יחשך] carrying on [17] לְהָסִיר: *that he may*, etc. (Di. De. Bu. RVm.). [Du. ויחשך or לחשך: but for the absence of waw in 𝔐, cp. Is. 64[1], Pr. 2[2].]

מני] see on 6[16] and 31[7].

וחיתו] חַיָּה a late syn. for נפש, and probably properly (Hengst. Bu.) an adj. *the living one* (*sc.* נפש: cf. נפש חַיָּה, Gn. 2[7], al.; and יְחִידָה, Ps. 22[21] 35[17]; except 38[39], always ‖ to נפש, and except 33[20], in the ‖ following clause): vv.[22. 28] 36[14], Ps. 78[50] (לא חשך ממות נפשם וְחַיָּתָם לדבר הסגיר), 143[3] (in the orig., Ps. 7[6] חַיַּי), perhaps 74[19b]; and of the soul, as the seat of *appetite* (v.[20] n.), 33[20] 38[39] †.

מעבר בשלח] cf. [28] פדה נפשו מעבר בשחת, and 36[12] בְּשֶׁלַח יַעֲבֹרוּ. שֶׁלַח is a late word (36[12], Jl. 2[8], 2 Ch. 23[10] (for כֵּלִים in the ‖ 2 K. 11[11]) 32[5], Neh. 4[11. 17] †) for *missile*, *dart* (Arab. *silāḥ*, weapon): עבר ב׳ is rendered by Di. (cf. EVV. perish *by*) *pass away* (= disappear, perish; cf. 34[20] ויעברו), *through* or *by* the missiles of Divine retribution; by Hi. De. Bu. Du. *pass on into* (cf. v.[28] מֵעֲבֹר בשחת) the missiles, fig. for, rush into destruction unconsciously, De. remarking that עבר, sq. ב׳, has the presumption of meaning to "pass on *into*" (as v.[28]). Du.'s בִּשְׁאֹלָה (both here and 36[12]) forms an excellent ‖ to [a], and is in itself very suitable (Bu.'s objection that it is "without parallels" is only partly true: there are many cases of the ה *loc.* after ב, as Jos. 15[21] בַּנֶּגְבָּה; and Ps. 9[18] לִשְׁאוֹלָה occurs); but it is venturesome to make the same correction *twice* (here and 36[12]); and unusual expressions are char-

acteristic of Elihu. 𝕲 ἐν πολέμῳ is evidently a paraphrase of 𝕸.

19. וְהוּכַח] the tense is correct, the pf. with *waw cons.* describing what is likely to happen often (cf. [20a], and the bare impf. [21a]). 𝕲𝕾𝖁 וְהוֹכִחַ not altering the sense [but giving, as in [16], an active cstr.; 𝕲𝕷 also supply an obj.]. It might have been expected, however, that the new case would be introduced more distinctly (cf. 𝕲 πάλιν δέ): hence (Du.) it would be perhaps better to read גם יֻכַּח; Be.[K] Bu. או יוכחנו. But 𝕲 πάλιν may be merely explanatory.

מכאוב] [here only in Job; in 2[13] 16[6] כאב].

משכבו] 𝕲𝖁, Bi. Grimme, Be.[K] משכב [as in v.[15]: note the similarity of the expressions describing the occasions or means of Divine discipline בתנומות עלי משכב, במכאוב על מ׳].

ריב] so Kt. Hi. De. Dav. Bu. RV.: "While the strife of his bones is perennial": רוֹב, Qrê, Or. (both Kt. and Qrê) 𝕲 (Θ) (πλῆθος), 𝕾 (ܣܘܓܐܐ), 𝕿 (סוגעי), 𝖁 (omnia), Ew. Di. RVm. Du.: "While the multitude of his bones (*vid.* 4[14]) are firm" (Du. *are lamed*: אִמֵּר for אֵתָן after 𝕲 (Θ) ἐνάρκησεν 𝖁 marescere facit). Fried. Del. explains ריב from Assyr. *rûb* = ἐκλείπειν, *to vanish* (*HWB* 614 f.). Sgf., for ריב or רוב, בְּאֵב, Be. רָקָב (cf. Pr. 12[4] כְּרָקָב בעצמותיו, 14[30] וּרְקַב עצמות קנאה, Hab. 3[16] רקב בַּעֲצָמַי: for רקב see on 5[3]).

20. וְזִהֲמַתּוּ חַיָּתוֹ לחם] The pf. with *waw cons.* (frequent.), as v.[19]. זָהַם † only here (but *vid.* on 6[7]). Aram. זְהֵים is to *be foul*, 38[14] 𝕿 כְּסוּ זְהֵים, a *soiled* garment; Syr. ܙܗܡ is to *make foul*, ܡܙܗܡ, *fetid*; Arab. *zahima* is to *stink*, or *be fetid* (Lane, 1263), *zahama* is to *repel* (Freyt.: cf. Daûd Alfâsi, as cited by De.); and חַיָּה here, as in 38[39], is a syn. of נפש (v.[18] n.), as the seat of *appetite* (Ps. 107[9], Is. 5[14] and often). Hence 𝕸 may be rendered: (1) His appetite *maketh* it, bread, *foul*, i.e. *treats it as loathsome* (the sf. in וזהמתו anticipating the obj.: see 29[3] n.); so (virtually) EVV. *abhorreth bread*; or (2), from the Arab., His appetite *makes* him *repel* bread; so virtually Di. De. The Arab. *repel* (unless *zahama* means properly to *loathe*) is somewhat remote; so (1) is preferable. The anticipatory sf. is,

however, rare, and often textually doubtful (see 29^8 n.), and its use here seems gratuitous: so prob. וְהֵמָּה (cf. on 6^7) should be read (Du. Be.; Bu. alt.).

21. יִכֶל] for the juss. form, see on 13^{27} $18^{9.12}$ (Dr. § 172).

מֵרֹאִי] in pause for מֵרְאִי, as 1 S. 16^{12} (טוֹב רֹאִי); so חֳלִי, יֳפִי, etc. (G-K. 29*m* end, 93*s*). *Away from seeing* (= so that it cannot be seen; so Hi. De.): מִן, as Gn. 23^6 27^1, Is. 23^1. The rendering *vom Ansehen* (or *vom Ansehnlichkeit*) *weg*, *without fair appearance* (Di. Bu.; De. perhaps preferable), seems to put more into רְאִי than it contains, making it = מַרְאֶה, which does mean not only *appearance*, but also *fair appearance*; in 1 S. 16^{12} ראי has itself a neutral sense, and the expression only means definitely "*good*-looking" through טוֹב. Du. Be. מֵרָזִי (Is. 24^{16} †), *through leanness*; but "as Is. 24^{16} is dubious, read then מֵרָזוֹן" (Bu.), as Is. 10^{16}. 𝕲 ἕως ἂν σαπῶσιν αὐτοῦ αἱ σάρκες, not expressing מראי.

ושפי] [עצמתיו is ‖ to בשרו in ᵃ: presumably, then, ושפי is parallel to יכל, and לא ראו to מראי; but the two last terms are suspiciously alike, and not improbably לא ראו is a corruption of מראי which was repeated from ᵃ to the extrusion of the original parallel term in ᵇ (cp. 8^3 n., and *Forms of Hebrew Poetry*, 295 f.). 𝕲 may be a paraphrase of 𝕸, or of some earlier form of the text; in it κενά (whence King in *JThS* xv. 79 לְרִק, rendering, very hazardously, *with emaciation*) corresponds to לא ראו, καὶ ἀποδείξῃ to ושפי. The root שפה in OT. occurs elsewhere only in the Nif. part נשפה (הר), Is. 13^2, a *wind-swept*, *bare* mountain, and the noun שפי, pl. שפיים, of hills that were *bare*, or *wind-swept*, possibly also in the obscure שפות, *cream* (?), or *cheese* (?), 2 S. 17^{29}. In Arabic سفا is used of wind lifting up and carrying away dust, as, *e.g.*, سفت الريح التراب; hence the commonly accepted explanation of נשפה, שפי in Hebrew as applied to hills. Here, if the text is correct, the word might mean *bare*, denuded of flesh (cp. سَفًا, *emaciation*), and must have some such sense, if עצמתיו לא ראו is correct, and really means *his bones which were* (*formerly*) *not seen* (because covered with flesh); cp. 𝔙 et ossa, quæ tecta fuerant, nuda-

bantur, and Yahuda (who in *JQR* xv. 712 f. equates שפף with شف to be transparent) ***his bones become visible.*** Certainly this makes the v. hyperbolical: his flesh has entirely disappeared, and his bones, no longer clothed with flesh, alone are to be seen! But the hyperbole must not be avoided by weakening down the picture to that of bones sticking out under the flesh, as in EV. "his bones . . . stick out": this translation goes back to Sebastian Münster's version, extra prominent ossa eius, quæ (prius) videri nequibant, and this in turn to Jewish exegesis represented by Levi ben Gershom's equivalence שׁפו, נגבהו, which was suggested, perhaps, by the fact that שפי is a term for a hill, and a hill sticks up and is high; but a hill was not so termed as being something high and prominent, but (see above) as a bare, wind-swept place. If לא ראו is not original, or (see next n.) not a relative sentence, it would be simpler to assume for שפו here the sense common in Aramaic of ***crushing***: cp. לב תביר ושפי, a broken and ***crushed*** heart, Ps. 50[19] 𝕿; cp. also Ps. 51[10], where it is used of bones, 89[11] (these and other examples in Levy): then render ***and crushed are his bones*** (without ceasing, or the like), or ***the crushing of his bones is***—(unceasing). For the construction, if שְׁפִי (Kt.) is predicative, see Dr. 188 (2); the change to שֻׁפּוּ (Qrê) is unnecessary, and indeed gives a rather improbable use of the waw conv. with the pf. Be. proposes ושחפו: cp. שחפת as the name of a disease in Dt. 28[22]].

לֹא רֻאוּ] [the Pual of ראה here only, and here, perhaps, only because the punctuation has to make the best of a bad text (see last n.). But Di. suggests that the meaning is not simply ***to appear, be seen*** (נִרְאָה), but ***to present a*** מראה, ***i.e.*** a (fair) ***appearance.*** This sense, if intended, is more safely obtained from Bu.'s emendation לא נאוו (the second ו from ותקרב in v.[22])—a good parallel to ראי in [a], if that meant goodly appearance, but see n. above. Both Di. and Bu. regard לא ראו (לא נאוו) not as a relative sentence qualifying עצמותיו, but as a second predicate: ***his bones are bare, without*** (fair) ***appearance*** (or, Bu., ***unattractive***)].

22. לַממתים] 𝕲 ἐν ᾅδῃ, paraphrasing; 𝕾𝕿 ***unto death,*** 𝖁

mortiferi, Hfm. Perles, Bu. Be. לְמוֹ מֵתִים (for לְמוֹ see on 27[14]). But (Du.) "the fact that the ממיתים do not occur elsewhere, any more than does the מליץ of v.[23], is not a sufficient reason for correcting the text" (similarly Peake). [Yet rhythmically Bu., if למו might be stressed (yet see 27[14] n.), would be more probable than 𝔐 (3 : 2 ; see 17[13] n.); and the "slayers" would more naturally have been mentioned before the pit.]

23. עליו] *on behalf of, for him*; as 42[8] [after התפלל and, as here, of angelic intervention, Dn. 12[1] העמד . . . מיכאל על בני עמך; Lex. 754*a*, *b*].

מלאך] [Nichols om., reviving (with Genung, who retains 'מ) an earlier view that the מליץ is human (and, indeed, Elihu himself), not angelic. For earlier theories of this kind see Schult.; for a sufficient criticism of them, Di. The omission of מלאך would spoil the parallelism, and is certainly not required by the metre].

להגיד] [𝔊 ἀναγγείλῃ δέ; Du. Be.[K] ("fortasse") יגיד].

ישרו] 𝔊 τὴν ἑαυτοῦ μέμψιν, whence Be. Du. מוּסָרוֹ (cf.[16]). [𝔐, if correct, must mean *what is right for him*, ישר being rather different in meaning from, *e.g.*, v.[3] 6[25], and not quite the same as Pr 11[24] 14[2], to which Di. appeals.]

24. ויחננו] The implicit subj. is God (Hi. De. Di. Dav.), or the angel (Du. Peake): Bu. יְחָנֶּנּוּ וְיֹאמַר; but [cp. Dr. § 138 and the examples *ib.* ii. *a* of waw conv. with the impf. following the pf. in a protasis: *e.g.* Nu. 5[27] 35[22-24]].

פדעהו †] No vb. פדע is known: read either (5 MSS, Wr. Grä. Hfm. Bu. Du.) פְּרָעֵהוּ, or (Hrz. Ew. Di. Bi.) פְּדֵהוּ (Del. takes פדע, improbably, to be a by-form of פדה). פרע, to *let loose*, occurs in Hif. Ex. 5[4], and Qal Ex. 32[25]; but it is most frequent in Pr., where its obj. is usually מוּסָר (1[25] 4[15] פרעהו אל תעבר בו, 8[33] 13[18] 15[32] (פורע מוסר מואס נפשו); פדה would be suitable in *God's* mouth (cf.[b], and פדה, || כֹּפֶר, Ps. 49[8]; and also v.[28]), but not as addressed to the *angel*. It is true, פרע is elsewhere always used in a bad sense, and never as merely = to *release*, *free*; but on the whole it seems to have the advantage of פדה. If פדהו is right, we must suppose that it is used *merely* as a syn. for to *deliver*. The v. is without symmetry: Bu. would

read either ויחננו ויאמר פרעהו מצאתי כפר נפשו (מרדת שחת a gloss; כפר נפשו (as Ex. 30[12], Pr. 13[8]) after Bi.[1], so also Be. St.; Du. לנפשו), or, with Grimme, ויחננו ויאמר פרעהו מרדת שחת מצאתי כפר.
𝔊 has for v.[23–25]:

[23a] ἐὰν ὦσιν χίλιοι ἄγγελοι θανατηφόροι, εἷς αὐτῶν οὐ μὴ τρώσῃ αὐτόν.
ἐὰν νοήσῃ τῇ καρδίᾳ ἐπιστραφῆναι πρὸς Κύριον,
[23b] ἀναγγείλῃ δὲ ἀνθρώπῳ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ μέμψιν,
(? 23b. bis) τὴν δὲ ἄνοιαν αὐτοῦ δείξῃ,
[24a] ἀνθέξεται τοῦ μὴ πεσεῖν εἰς θάνατον·
ἀνανεώσει δὲ αὐτοῦ τὸ σῶμα ὥσπερ ἀλοιφὴν ἐπὶ τοίχου, τὰ δὲ ὀστᾶ αὐτοῦ ἐμπλήσει μυελοῦ·
[25a] ἁπαλυνεῖ δὲ αὐτοῦ τὰς σάρκας ὥσπερ νηπίου,
[25b] ἀποκαταστήσει δὲ αὐτὸν ἀνδρωθέντα ἐν ἀνθρώποις.

Here it is evident that [23. 24] are rendered very freely; and that there is an addition after [23a], and either an addition, or a free doublet of [25], after [24a]. Du. recovers from 𝔊 two new couplets: אִם יֵשׁ בְּלִבּוֹ לָשׁוּב אֶל־אֵל וְיוֹדִיעֵהוּ חַטָּאתוֹ : יְחַדֵּשׁ שְׁאֵרוֹ כְּטִיחַ עַל־קִיר וִימַלֵּא מֹחַ עַצְמוֹתָיו: "whether," he adds, "the couplets are original here, or only a marginal citation, cannot so easily be decided: in any case they would not be unsuitable after [25], but they look much more like an alternative text of [23–25], especially with 𝔊's למו מות for לממיתים in [22b]" (which, however, Du. does not accept). [The irregularity in form extends back to v.[23]; in 𝔐 v.[23] is a tristich (3 : 3 : 3); [24] is also a tristich and very abnormal (2 : 3 : 2). The tristichs with certain other doubtful features have been or may be avoided, in more ways than one. (1) Bu., in addition to changes in v.[24] noted above, omits in v.[23] מליץ and אחד מני אלף, so obtaining from [23f.] two distichs 3 : 3; but at the same time he very questionably destroys an existing distich 3 : 3 ([23a. b]), which shows a form of parallelism similar to those discussed in *Forms of Hebrew Poetry*, pp. 78–80; (2) Du. apart from the addition of לנפשו at the end of [24], and changes which are rhythmically neutral, simply corrects the verse division of 𝔐, connecting [23a. b] (3 : 3), [23c. 24a] (3 : 2), [24b. c] (3 : 3): for 3 : 2, see 17[14] n. (3) v.[24] may be reduced to 3 : 3 as by Bu. (1): and v.[23] expanded to two distichs (3 : 3 and 3 : 2) by providing [23c] with a parallel from 𝔊 (the 4th line of

v.[23] as cited from 𝔊 above); in favour of this is the *order* of the words suggested by 𝔊 וחטאתו ידיעהו (not ויודיעהו ח׳, as Du.), for this order would then be due to desire for variety of order in parallel lines (*Forms*, pp. 64 ff., 73 ff.).]

25. רֻטֲפַשׁ] [since this is (1) abnormal in form, quadriliterals produced by the addition of ר commonly having the ר *after* the first radical (G–K. 30*q*), and (2) a pf., though in such an apodosis the pf. with waw consecutive or an impf. (cp. ישוב in [b]), would be normal (Dr. § 138. ii., where one instance only of the pf., Ezk. 3[19], and that not quite similar to the present, is cited), it is simplest to regard רטפש as an error for יטפש, not (*ZATW* vi. 212: Kön. *Lex.*), through dittography of ר, for טפש. The meaning of טפש is presumably *to be plump*, or *fat*: in Ps. 119[70] it is used, as frequently in 𝔗, metaphorically of the *insensibility* of the heart: cp. השמן in Is. 6[10], which is rendered by טפיש in 𝔗. In Assyr. ṭapâšu is *to be fat*. Those who retain רטפש appeal for support (cp. Ges. B. *s.v.*) to ܛܪܦܫܐ, *lean flesh* (a meaning the opposite of which is required here) with the ר in its normal position *after* the first radical, and to the Assyr. ritpašu, *wide, broad, receptive* (Del. *Assyr. Handwörterbuch*, p. 626*b*), which has, however, not ט but ת, and is connected not with the root טְפשׁ but with רפשׁ, *to be broad*].

מִנֹּעַר] נֹעַר, *youth* (*i.e.* the age of youth), 36[14], Ps. 88[16] (גֹוֵעַ מִנֹּעַר), Pr. 29[21] †; = נְעֻרִים, 13[26] 31[18] al. Hrz. Hi. Du. *more than* (in) *youth* (see on 11[7]): Di. (objecting that this rendering would go beyond [b]), De. Bu. *through youthful vigour, youthfulness* (*von Jugend*(*kraft*), *Jugendfrische*). [𝔊 כַּנַּעַר, *as that of a youth*, cp. 2 K. 5[14].]

יָשׁוּב] Bi. Du. Be.[K] יָשֹׁב (with יטפש in [a]), supposing [25] to continue the address to the angel, and taking both verbs as jussives; but this is not probable.

עֲלוּמָיו] 20[11].

26. וַיִּרְצֵהוּ וג׳] Bu. וְיָשֹׁב . . . וְיִרְצֵהוּ וְיַרְאֵ[הוּ].

וירא] The sense shows that the subj. is the restored sufferer: וַיַּרְאֵהוּ, *and he* (*God*) *lets him see* (Bu. [וַיַּר׳], Oo., Be.[K] with ?) is not necessary. [In spite of the intervening וירצהו with

God as subj., the subj. of וירא would easily be understood to be the same as that of its parallel term יעתר. Bu.'s emendation would, however, prepare the way for וישב in [c], if that were correct; but see next n.]

וישב] Du. Be. וַיְסַפֵּר, or (better) וַיְבַשֵּׂר. The emendation is attractive; but the following על אנשים in [27] (with which לאנוש, with the emendation, is virtually identical in meaning) is an objection to it. [But the repetition of אנוש in the two parallel lines may be due to transcriptional error of the kind referred to in 8^3 n. Ehrlich in [27a] אֲנֻשִׁים, *the sick*, is improbable: it requires him to emend ישר to יָשֻׁב (thus repeating the vb. of [26c]) and to assume for השיב the meaning *to narrate*. Apart from the repetition, Du.'s emendation makes of [26c. 27a] an excellent distich of parallel lines: in 𝔐 [26c. 27a] are two isolated stichoi between the distichs [26a. b] and [27b. c].]

27. יָשֹׁר] Rd. יָשִׁיר. יָשֹׁר might, no doubt, be a poetical indic. for יָשׁוּר; but שׁוּר, as an alternative to שִׁיר, to *sing*, occurs only once (1 S. 18^6 Kt.); and most probably יָשֹׁר is intended by the Massoretes to express the sense of *He looketh* (𝔙 respiciet; Rabb. AV. RVm.).

העויתי] [not from the root עוה = غوى, whence עָוֹן, *error, iniquity*, but from 'ע = عوى, *to bend, twist* (in Arabic, *e.g.*, of bending a bow, twisting a rope, a turban, etc.); cp. Ps. 38^7, Is. 21^3, La. 3^9, Jer. 3^{21}; and see Dr. on 1 S. 20^{30}]. 𝔊 for חטאתי וישר העויתי has merely Οἷα συνετέλουν;

ולא שוה לי] [𝔐 (שָׁוָה) *non æquale factum est mihi* is supposed to mean: it was not requited to me (Del. Di. Dr. RVmg.), though there is no other instance of שָׁוָה with this nuance: still this rendering is less unjustifiable than RV. text, "and it profited me not," and gives substantially what was doubtless the meaning of the originally longer line. 𝔐 might perhaps be translated: *and it was not meet* (or, *sufficient*) *for me* (RVmg.); cp. Est. 3^8 5^{23}; but this would give a poor sense, and the line would still remain too short. 𝔥 can also be pointed שִׁוָּה: *he hath not made equal*; unless this meant he hath not requited, emendation is necessary]. 𝔊 καὶ οὐκ ἄξια ἤτασέν με ὧν ἥμαρτον, whence Bi. *m.c.* ולא שָׁוָה לי בְּחַטָּאתִי;

Du. וְלֹא שָׁוָה לִי כַּעֲוֹנִי (cf. 11[6], as read by him); Bu., to make the subj. clearer, וְאֵל לֹא שָׁוָה לִי; Be.[K] as either Bi. or Bu. Bu. adds: "if it is thought necessary to change שוה, שִׁלַּם would probably be better than Sgf. הֵשִׁיב."

28. נַפְשִׁי . . . חַיָּתִי] so Kt. 𝔊 𝔖; נפשו . . . חַיָּתוֹ, Qrê 𝔗𝔙, referring the words to Elihu, who, however, only begins to speak again in his own person in v.[29].

מעבר בשחת] an expression not found elsewhere; and Bu. would either substitute for it the מרדת שחת removed by him from [24], or read, with 2 MSS, as [18] 36[12], מעבר בשלח. But may not Del.'s judgment be sound, that it is one of the peculiar expressions which Elihu uses? [At present v.[28] is rhythmically 4 : 3; if any emendation be attempted, it will be safer so to emend as to restore a 3 : 3 rhythm: possibly an original משחת was written בשחת, and then under the influence of v.[18] amplified by the insertion of מעבר.]

29. פעמים שלש] for the omission of וּ, cf. Is. 17[6]. "Its omission gave rise to the reading פַּעֲמַיִם שָׁלֹשׁ, which is expressed by nearly all Vss." (Hrz. *ap.* Di.).

30. להשיב] Be.[K], after 𝔖, הֵשִׁיב or מֵשִׁיב, quite needlessly.

לֵאוֹר] for לְהֵאוֹר, with elision of ה, for which in Nif. there are a few (doubtful) parallels, G–K. 51*l* (the elision in *Hif.* is more frequent: *ib.* 53*q*). Du. בּוֹ אור חיים (better, לָאִיר (לְהָאִיר), to let the light of life shine upon him. 𝔖 Bu. Be.[K] ("perh."), St. לִרְאוֹת for לֵאוֹר (cf. [28]).

32. חפצתי צַדְּקֶךָּ] [the infin. after חפץ without ל (cp. G–K. 114*m*), and exceptionally with *nun energicum* before the suffix (G–K. 61*d*). The punctuation צִדְקֶךָ as a noun would also be possible].

33. אם אַיִן] cf. Gn. 30[1] ואם אַיִן מֵתָה אנכי.

CHAPTER XXXIV.

3, 4. [𝕷[1] om.: MSS and edd. of 𝕲 supply the vv. from Θ: τὸ καλὸν, however, at the end of [2] 𝕲 (= מה טוב, [4] 𝕳) shows that the translators of 𝕲 had [3. 4] before them, though they left the vv. almost entirely untranslated; so Di. Be. Bu. (against Bi.).]

3. יִטְעַם לֶאֱכֹל] tastes *in order to eat* (tries before eating), Hi. Di.; tastes *in eating* (לאכל with a gerundial force), Del. 𝕲 (Θ) 𝕾𝕿 βρῶσιν, ܡܐܟܘܠܬܐ, *escas* = לְאֹכֶל (ל, the *nota accus.*, as 5^2 n.),—unless, of course, as EVV. (*tasteth meat*), they merely paraphrase. Bu. very plausibly, יטעם לו אֹכֶל; cf. 12^{11} וחך אֹכֶל יטעם לו.

4. נבחרה] Grä. נִבְחֲנָה.

[בינינו] בֵּין, *among*, as Hos. 13^{15}, Ca. $2^{2.3}$, Ezk. 19^2 31^3.]

6. על] = *in spite of*, as 10^7 16^{17}.

אֲכַזֵּב] *I am to lie!* (or, *Am I to lie?*), Di. De. Da., RV. (virtually): the impf., with the same modal force as 9^{29} (*n.*). Du. אֲכֻזָּב, *I am deceived*: but (Bu.) נִכְזַב is not to *be deceived*, but (Pr. 30^6) to *be made a liar*; the sense is thus substantially that of 𝕸. Hi. Am I to lie *against* my right? (cf. AV., RVm.), *i.e.* Am I falsely to admit my guilt? [Ehrlich אֶכְאַב, and this, or something similar, forming a better parallel than אכזב to אנוש חצי, may well be right: cp. Jer. 15^{18} כאבי נצח ומכתי אנושה].

חצי] Du. ("perhaps") מַחְצִי (Is. 30^{26}); Be.[K] "prps." חָלְיִי, מַחְצִי. 𝕲 (Θ) τὸ βέλος μου = 𝕸.

בלי פשע] 33^9.

7. [Line [a] is short: possibly a word parallel in sense to line [b] has dropped out after כאיוב.]

8. וְאָרַח] Pf. with *waw cons.*, with a frequentative force, carrying on ישתה.

לחברה] an unusual fem. form of the inf.: G–K. 45*d*.

וללכת] may carry on וארח (EVV. Ew. Del. Di. al.), *and is for going*, etc. (Dr. 206; Is. 44[28b], Jer. 19[12] al.). But it is more natural to take it (Hi. Di. Bu.) as ‖ to לחברה.

9. לא יסכן] סכן here intrans. = to *make profit*; in 15[3] 22[2] (sq. ל), 35[3] (sq. ל) trans. to *profit*.

ברצתו עם] רצה עִם, as Ps. 50[18] אם ראית גַּנָּב וַתִּרֶץ עִמּוֹ; רצה עם (or ב), is to *be pleased with*: it thus expresses rather less than AV. RV. *delight himself with*, and rather more than RVm. *consent with* (as Ps. 50[18] EVV.).

10. לכן אנשי לבב שמעו לי] The line is short: hence Bi. Du. insert חֲכָמִים הַאֲזִינוּ after לָכֵן, which would in itself be a good parallel to אנשי לבב. Still the short line may have been intended to make the introductory exhortation to attend more emphatic.

חָלִלָה לָאֵל מֵרֶשַׁע] On the constr. of חללה with אם, *v. Lex.* (27[5] n.). When construed with מן, [the act or thing deprecated is regularly expressed by the infin. (*e.g.* Gn. 18[25]); there would be nothing very strange in nouns taking the place of the infin. as here in 𝔐 in both [a] and [b] (מֵרֶשַׁע, מֵעָוֶל), though the only actual parallel in OT. is the use of the *pronoun* in Jos. 22[29]. But the difference here between nouns and infinitives (מֵרְשֹׁעַ, מֵעֲוֵל) is merely one of punctuation; and if a word has been lost in [b] (see below) an infinitive in that line was almost certainly originally read, and in that case רשע in [a] is naturally pointed as an infin. also].

ושדי] [The force of the ל in [a] is extended to [b]]: cp. G–K. 119*hh*. Bi. Be. Du. St. *m. c.* וּלְשַׁדַּי, to lengthen the short line,—though the lengthening effected, except upon Bi.'s system (*Ulé Shadday me'ável*), is very slight. It is, however, an improvement stylistically, though not perhaps a necessary one (see 15[3]; but the instances cited by Del. from Is. (15[8] 28[6] 48[14] 61[7]) cannot be termed elegancies). Bu. *m. c.* מִפְּעֹל עָוֶל (cf.[32] אם עול פעלתי, 36[23b]), which naturally brings with it in [a] מֵרְשֹׁעַ for מֵרֶשַׁע. 𝔊 *μή μοι εἴη* (as though חלילה לי,—against the context) *ἔναντι κυρίου ἀσεβῆσαι, καὶ ἔναντι παντοκράτορος ταράξαι τὸ δίκαιον*, which somewhat supports Be. Du. in reading ולשדי [and

Bu. in assuming a third word in ^{b}. The rhythm in 𝕳, Bi. Be. Du. is 3 : 2 (17^{13} n.); in Bu. it is normal—3 : 3; the normal rhythm is also obtained if we read מְעַוֵּת צדק, as in 8^3 (יעות צ׳), with 𝔊, which has the same phrase in both passages—ταράξαι (8^3 ταράξει) τὸ δίκαιον].

11. פעל] 1 MS Reiske, Grä. Be. כְּפֹעַל, which might, of course, be right, but is not necessary (cf. וּגְמוּל ידי אדם ישיב לו, Pr. 12^{14}): 𝔊𝔖 have *according to*, but this may be merely a paraphrase.

[וכארח] 𝔊 καὶ ἐν τρίβῳ = ובארח, which would give a very poor sense.]

ימציאנו] cause it to *find*, *overtake*, *befall*, Hif. of מצא, as used in such passages as 31^{29}, Dt. 31^{17}, Ps. 21^{9}, Is 10^{14}.

12. אף אמנם] 19^{4}.

ירשיע] the Hif., in the sense *act wickedly* (the "internal" Hif., G–K. 53*d*), is a late usage: Dn. 9^{5} and Ps. 106^{6} הִרְשַׁעְנוּ (in the original passage, 1 K. 8^{47}, רשענו). Bu. Du. Be.^{K} St. יִרְשַׁע, which, as הרשיע is trans. in vv.$^{17.\ 29}$, may be right.

13. פקד עליו] *entrusted to* him: פקד על as 36^{23}, Nu. 4^{27}, 2 Ch. 36^{23}.

ארצה] here and 37^{12} might be a poetical form for ארץ (properly an old accus. termination: G–K. 90*f*); but it is more probably a false punctuation for אַרְצֹה = אַרְצוֹ (so 1 MS), Bi. Bu. Be. (compare especially Pr. 8^{31} with 37^{12}).

שָׂם] Schl. Hi. supply in thought עליו from ^{a}, who hath *laid* (upon him), etc.?; but ומי implies a *new* sentence into which it would be very forced to carry over the force of עליו. Be. would *insert* עליו after שם, which, of course, is unexceptionable [giving a real parallel to פקד על; but it produces the doubtful rhythm 3 : 4 (21^{16} n.)]; Di. Del. *set, founded* (38^{5}, Is 44^{7} (text doubtful)): but in this sense שָׂם would be a weak word; in 20^{4} (cited in Be.^{T}) מני שים אדם עלי ארץ, the addition of עלי ארץ makes the case entirely different. Bu. שָׁמַר, *keepeth*, Du. בְּתֵבֵל, "And who *attendeth to* the whole world?" שָׂם (*sc.* לִבּוֹ; see next n.), as 23^{6} al. EVV. *disposed*, reads into שָׂם more than it contains: *posuit*, not *disposuit*, is the equivalent of שָׂם.

14. יָשִׂים] so Or.^{Qrê} (Baer, p. 58): 5 MSS Or$^{Kt.}$ יָשִׁיב;

cp. 𝔖. שָׂם לִבּוֹ אֶל is to *set one's heart* (*i.e.* mind or attention) *upon*, to *regard* (1[8] (עַל), 2[3]); הֵשִׁיב לִבּוֹ אֶל, to *turn back one's attention to*, would, if correct, mean substantially the same. Either רוחו or נשמתו would, in this case, seem to be superfluous: omitting one (Ley omits רוחו) we get, "If he were to set (or turn) his attention on himself, and gather unto himself his breath." But a much better parallelism is obtained [and the normal 3 : 3 rhythm restored] by omitting לבו (as originally a marginal gloss on [18b] שָׂם, which has found its way by error into the text of [14a]), and reading אם ישיב אליו רוחו; so Bi. Bu. Du. Be.

(1) אליו] [as in [b] refers to God; but under the influence of the intrusive לבו (see last n.), 𝔙 (ad eum) referred it to man: and RV. actually substitutes "man" for "him"].

16. ואם־בִּינָה] בינה, as accented, can be only the imper., for which, however, after אם, even if אם be taken as expressing a wish (Ps. 81[9] 95[7] 139[19]), there is no parallel (in Gn. 23[13], even if the text is correct, לוּ precedes the imper.,—אם אתה לוּ שְׁמָעֵנִי): the least change that is necessary is, therefore, בִּינָה, and if (there is) *understanding* (so Di. Du.): but in this case ואם יֵשׁ בינה would be expected, and it is much better to read בִּינֹתָ (Bu. Be.). 𝔊 'ΑΣ 𝔖𝔗𝔙 all express a verb: but this is scarcely evidence that they *read* בִּינֹתָ; they may be free renderings of אִם־בִּינָה.

17. האף] 40[8] [Gn. 18[23] האף תספה צדיק עם רשע, wilt thou really sweep away the righteous with the wicked, Am. 2[11] האף אין זאת, Is not this really (so)? So here: can one . . . really govern? or the force of אף may here be expressed in English by emphasis, an incredulous *can*? *Lex.* 65*a*].

יחבוש] חבש is to *bind, bind up*, especially a wound (Hos. 6[1] al.), and the hair (Ex. 29[9]): here = *keep under control*, fig. for *rule*. The sense (only here) is peculiar (cf. עָצַר, 1 S. 9[17]); and perhaps based on Is. 3[7] לא אהיה חֹבֵשׁ (𝔊 ἀρχηγός), though there the sense *bind* is clearly felt, the meaning being, bind up and repair the ruined state.

צדיק כביר] [On the two adjectives ἀσυνδέτως, as often in Arabic, see] Ew. 270*d*; Del. [Kön. iii. 376*m*].

תרשיע] 2 MSS ירשיע (*act wickedly*, as [12]); so also 𝔗 יְחַיֵּיב

(only misunderstanding ירשיע in the sense of *condemns*, Dt. 25[1]); Be. יַרְשִׁעַ.

18. הַאֹמֵר] read with 1 MS 𝔊 (ὁ λέγων), 𝔖𝔙, Mich. Ew. Di. Bu. Du. RVm. etc. הָאֹמֵר. הַאֱמֹר (the form אֱמֹר, as Pr. 25[7] אֲמָר־, Ezk. 25[8] Mass. and old edd.†: with prefixes always בֶּאֱמֹר, לֵאמֹר) is supposed to mean, *Is there a saying . . . ? = Can it be said . . . ?* or (EVV.) "Is it *fit* to say . . . ?"; but there is no parallel to this use of the simple *inf. c.* (כִּי טוֹב אֲמָר־לְךָ, Pr. 25[7], cited by Del., is quite different): to express such an idea would require הֶאָמֹר (cf. 40[2], Jer. 7[9]), or הֲלֶאֱמֹר (cf. Est. 7[8], 2 Ch 19[2], Gn. 30[15]; Dr. 204 *end*), or הֲיֵשׁ לֶאֱמֹר (cf. 2 S. 14[19] *al.*; Dr. 202. 1 with *n.*). Either הֶאָמֹר, or Grä. הֲיֹאמַר, or Honth. הָאֹמֵר (cf. v.[31]), or Ley מִי אָמַר (cf. 36[23]), would express substantially (and correctly) the supposed sense of 𝔐 (can בליעל be addressed to an earthly king? how much less then canst thou condemn the Almighty, v.[17b]?): but that the question [17b] can only be answered in the negative is evident without further proof; and this reading spoils the connection of אשר in [19a] (the insertion of *how much less to* in EVV. in [19a] is obviously quite illegitimate).

בליעל] [for איש ב׳, cp. 2 S. 23[6], Nah. 2[1]. On theories as to the etymology of the term, see Moore or Burney on Jg. 19[22]; *EBi. s.v.* Belial].

19. נִכַּר] 21[29] n. Du. proposes הכיר, *sc.* פנים.

שׁוֹעַ] [see n. on 36[19]].

לפני] *before, above*: as Gn. 48[20].]

כי מעשה ידיו כלם: [20a] רגע ימותו וחצות לילה] [19a. b] are obviously parallel lines; in spite of some corruption in [20b] (יגעשו ותו), [20b. c] are almost as obviously such: between these two distichs the intervening matter [19c. 20a] should form another distich; but, as a matter of fact, (1) the lines are anything but obvious parallels; (2) the rhythmical balance of the lines is doubtful, for [20a] is four- rather than three-stressed, giving the distich the very questionable rhythm 3 : 4 (21[16] n.); and perhaps it may be added, (3) רגע and חצות לילה look like parallel terms that should stand not in the same line, but in parallel lines. The alternative to regarding [19c. 20a] as a distich (Du.), is (RV. Bu.) to combine [19c] with [19a. b], and [20a] with [20b. c] so as to

obtain two tristichs; but this is not preferable. Tristichs are at most rare in Job, and that two successive tristichs should be created, the first by tacking on a non-parallel line at the *end* of a distich, and the second by *prefixing* a line to another distich, would be sufficiently suspicious. It is doubtful whether 19c. 20a are, as and where they stand, a part of the original text. 𝔊 has no translation of 19c in 𝔐, for such are not the last words of v.19—*θαυμασθῆναι πρόσωπα αὐτῶν*. 𝔊 in 20 is very free, if really a version of anything like 𝔐; Du. suggests that 𝔊 in 19. 20 contains a translation of 25 (to לילה) rather than of 19c. 20a. But 𝔊 cannot be safely appealed to against the originality of these lines.]

20. חצות לילה] [Ps. 119[62] and (ח׳ הל׳) Ex. 11[4] †: elsewhere חצי (ה)ל׳].

יגעשו עם ויעברו] a people (the people of such potentates, v.19a. b) are shaken violently, and pass away (Di. Del.). געש is to *shake violently*: of the earth, Ps. 18[8a. b], in Hithp. of waves *tossing themselves*, Jer. 5[22]; of nations reeling to and fro (under fig. of drunkenness), Jer. 25[16]. But the sense thus obtained is not satisfactory: we expect, as the subj. of ינעשו and יעברו, not עם, but the שרים and שוע of 19a. Bu. Be. Oo. Honth. שׁוֹעִים (שו fallen out after the preceding שו—) [Ehrlich שרים] for עָם: Du. מֵעָם for עם. The fig. of ינעשו is, however, very strong for either שועים (Bu.) or שרים and שׁוֹעַ (Du.): read probably יְגֹרְשׁוּ מֵעָם, they are *driven out from* a people (*i.e.* a people in which such men acquire pre-eminence), and pass away. [But the introduction of a special term ("the mighty") in 20c without a parallel in 20b is awkward: and it would be best, if ינרשו מעם be read in 20b, to emend 20c. Richter proposes for 20b. c ינעשו גם יעברו ויסירם אביר לא ביד, And a mighty one (viz. God) removes them without hand; but this by introducing a term for God as the subj. in 20c spoils the effect of the phrase לא ביד. Till something better than this is proposed, it is perhaps safest to assume that 20b. c each contained a term for the classes mentioned in 19a. b. To avoid the objection taken to ינעשו read יְנֻגְּעוּ; Bu. thought of יִגַּע, but rightly rejected the act. vb. on the ground that God is kept in the background.]

וִיסִירוּ אביר] 1 MS ויסורו, another ויסיר, another אבירים. The 3rd pl. can be explained (as 4[19] 6[2] 7[3] etc.) by G-K. 144g. But either Be. ויסורו אבירים, or Du. St. יָסִיר אביר (the subj. being God), or Bu. וְיוּסַר אביר, is preferable—the last being the neatest and best.

לא ביד] [cp. Dn. 2[34] עד די התגזרת אבן די לא בידין: not by human hands, but by something very different, viz. Divine agency. Similarly ההפוכה כמו רגע ולא חלו בה ידים, La. 4[6]: and, with אפס in place of לא, Dn. 8[25] באפס יד ישבר; cp. n. on אש לא נפח, 20[26]].

23. כי לא על איש יָשִׂים עוד] usually taken to mean, He doth not long (עוד as Gn. 46[29] ויבך על צואריו עוד, a rare usage) consider a man (ישים על, *sc.* לבו; see on v.[14]): Di., objecting that this says too little, He doth not *still* (after he has done the deed,—"erst noch") consider a man; Hi. De., taking שִׂים in the military sense which it has in 1 K. 20[12] (ויאמר שימו וישימו על העיר), He doth not long (עוד again as Gn. 46[29]) *attack* a man. But the עוד in either case is awkward and unsatisfactory: the first two renderings give a poor sense; and the third gives one neither suggested by the context nor probable (להלך אל אל במשפט). Read with Reiske, Wr. Bu. Be.[T] Du. יָשִׂים מוֹעֵד (Be.[K] יוּשַׂם מוֹעֵד, equally suitable though the pers. subj. has the support of the context: Du. Be. al. יֵשׁ מוֹעֵד), He doth not (like a human judge) appoint *a stated time* (1 S. 13[8] שמואל (אָמַר or שָׂם) לַמּוֹעֵד אשר) for a man (to appear, viz., for judgment, [23b]).

להלך אֶל־אל במשפט] The idiom is unusual; but it is unwise to substitute את for אל (Ehrlich), since this only half recovers the commoner idiom בוא את במ' (Ps. 14[32]) or בוא, הביא עם במ' (14[3] 22[4], Is. 3[14], Ec. 11[9]).]

24. ירע] Aram. for יָרֹץ, as Ps. 2[9] [Is. 24[19]: see *Isaiah*, p. 470].

כבירים] 8[2] n.

לא חקר] a short circumstantial clause introduced by a negative of the same type as 8[11] 24[10] etc. (Dr. 164). [Here the phrase means: without (the need of) investigation: in 36[26] as also in 5[9] 9[10]: without (the possibility) of investigation (Bu.).]

ויעמד] in the older Heb. העמיד is lit. to "make to *stand*," in the later Heb. it is used more formally in the sense of to *set* or *place*; cf. Dn. 11[11. 13. 14]; *LOT*[9] 535,[1] 503, No. 4. Bu. וְיַעֲמֵד.

25. מַעְבָּד †] an Aramaism (as Dn. 4[34], and often in Syr.) = Heb. מעשׂה. [To avoid the Aramaism Ehrlich, assuming haplography of מ, reads יכירם מַעְבְּדֵיהֶם.]

[לילה] acc. of time, *in the night*: cp. בקר, Ps. 5[4]; צהרים, Ps. 91[6]: G–K. 118*i*.]

26. תחת רשעים] *instead of* the wicked, which is supposed to mean *like* the wicked, *as if they were* wicked (𝔙 quasi impios), treating them as common malefactors; [and Ehrlich would even make במקום in [b] synonymous with תחת in this sense, emending ראים to רעים ‖ רשׁעים]. But this would imply that the כבירים were themselves not wicked: besides, תחת nowhere else means *like*. The text must thus be at fault. Bi.[1] Bu. תְּחַת חֲמָתוֹ רשעים, *His wrath shattereth* (Is. 9[8]) the wicked. The emendation [which restores to [26] the normal 3 : 3 rhythm and good parallelism without, like the emendation next noticed, destroying the normal rhythm in v.[25]] is a good one: whether it is right or not is more than we can say. Be.[T] יִדַּכְּאוּ מִתַּחְתָּם רשעים (מִתַּחְתָּם, *from their place*, as Ex. 10[23], Zec. 6[12]), with הֲפַכְם לילה in [25b]: this in itself is also good; but [25b] is rather short. Other more radical emendations do not commend themselves. 𝔊 omits [24b], and for [25-26] has: ὁ γνωρίζων [thus not expressing לכן] αὐτῶν τὰ ἔργα, ἔσβεσεν δὲ ἀσεβεῖς, ὁρατοὶ δὲ [*A* + ἐγένοντο] ἐναντίον αὐτοῦ, whence Bi.[2] obtains two distichs: ירע כבירים לא חֵקֶר כי יכיר מעבדיהם: יִדְּעֲכוּ רשעים ספקם במקום ראים:; Be.[K], keeping [24] as it is, omits [25] to לילה, and then reads: וְיִדַּכְּאוּ תַּחַת רִשְׁעָם רִשְׁעָם :(רְסִיסִים or) סְפָקָם במקום ראים:, after Houb. (so also Oo. St.); for רסיסים (Du.), *fissures*, *ruins* (common in Aram.), see Am. 6[11].

[במקום ראים] The phrase seems rather weak; but neither רעים (Ehrlich; see above) nor רפאם (Wr.) is a probable substitute for ראים.]

27. אשר על כן] usually regarded as a variant of כִּי עַל כֵּן, *Because* (Gn. 18[5] etc.; *Lex.* 475*b*); but Di. supposes על כן to point on to [28] להביא, "who *therefore* have turned aside from

after him, . . . *in order to bring*," etc. (this, however, is really nothing more than a statement of the literal sense of אשר על כן, and an explanation of the manner in which it (or כי על כן) comes to mean *Because*; see *Lex. l.c.*): in either case [28] expresses the *intention* of the acts described in [27]; the men in question so act with the intention of challenging God to assert Himself. 𝔊 ὅτι for אשר על כן, whence Bi. St. omit על כן; but the rendering is not evidence that 𝔊 did not *read* על כן; the translators of EVV. render *Because*, and they certainly read על כן.

28. להביא] whether this is dependent on על כן or on the verb in [27], the meaning is the same: the v. expresses (as explained above) the intention of the actions described in [27].

עליו] = אליו (*Lex.* 41*a*, 758*a*), cf. Gn. 18^{21}: hardly = *up to*, (for which Di. quotes Is. 17^7 31^1, 2 S. 15^4, 2 K. 25^{20}).

וצעקת] a different word might have been expected [𝔖 ܩܒܠܬܗܘܢ . . . ܨܠܘܬܗܘܢ: 𝔊 om.]: Du. suggests שַׁוְעַת (Ps. 18^7 34^{16} 40^2 102^2 al.) or צְוָחַת (Ps. 144^{14}, Is. 24^{11}, Jer. 14^2 46^{12} †); [cp. 8^3 n.].

ו . . . ישמע] after להביא, as 33^{17}: see Dr. § 118.

29. [Both lines are conditional sentences without conditional particles (G–K. 159*b*.): for the rhetorical question as the apodosis, cp. 9^{12} 11^{10} 23^{13}.]

וישקט] [may be punctuated as Qal יִשְׁקֹט, *is still*, *i.e.* does not interfere (cp. Ps. 83^2, Is. 62^1): even if punctuated יַשְׁקִט (𝔐), it still] may mean *showeth quietness* (37^{17}, Is. 7^4 57^{20} = Jer. 49^{23}); but the Hif. may be intended here to express *giveth quietness* (cf. Ps. 94^{13}). [Yahuda (*JQR* xv. 713) interprets ישקיט after Arab. أسقط, *casts down, causes to fall.*]

וְיַרְשִׁעַ] [To gain a more direct antithesis to ישקט, Hi. Del. Be.[T] (but not Be.[K]) emend ירשע to יַרְעִשׁ, *causeth disquiet* (cp. Is. 14^{16})—"eine Verschlimmbesserung" (Bu.). Ehrlich: יִוָּשֵׁעַ, if he be still, who can be saved?].

יְשׁוּרֶנּוּ] Bu. יְיַסְּרֶנּוּ, who will correct him? (40^2). Wr. Be.[T] (but not Be.[K]) [יְשָׁרֶנּוּ, from שרה (cp. 37^3), when he removes the condemned (lit. hides the face, viz. of the prisoner), who can release him?].

29, 30. [29c] ועל גוי ועל אדם יַחַד : [30a] מִמְּלֹךְ אדם חנף : [b] מִמֹּקְשֵׁי עם] [29c] Both towards (*or* against: *sc.* he hideth his face) a nation, and towards (*or* against) a man, alike; [30a] That a godless man reign not, [b] That there be no snares of the people (to lure them, viz. to destruction). The use of מן is in itself quite regular, both in [a] (*Lex. s.v.* מן, 7b (*a*)) and [b] (מִמֹּקְשֵׁי עָם = מִהְיוֹת מֹקְשֵׁי עָם, as 1 K. 15^{13}, Is. 7^{8} al.: *Lex. s.v.* מן, 7b (*b*)); but the sense of both [29c] and [30b] is forced. Bu. regards [29c] as a gloss, intended to state expressly that [29a. b] is applicable to an individual (Job), not less than to a nation: he then continues (connecting with [29a]), after 𝔊 (*βασιλεύων*), 𝔗 (מִמַּנֵּי מלכא), 𝔙 (qui regnare facit) מַמְלִיךְ אדם חנף, and then fills up the short [30b] by prefixing מֹשֵׁל: "When he maketh a godless man king, (Even) a ruler out of the snares (fig. for destroyers) of the people" (or, alternatively for [30b], מְעַקֵּשׁ מֵעֹשְׁקֵי עם, "a perverse one, of the oppressors of the people"). But, as the verbs in [29a. b] are sing., would there be any need to add a note to point out that the reference was to an individual, as well as to a people? Du., rejecting אדם חנף as a gloss intended to explain what the מֹקְשֵׁי עם are, makes a distich out of [29c. 30]: ועל גוי ועל אדם יֵעֹר מִמְּלֹךְ מוֹקְשֵׁי עָם (or יָעֻר), "But he *watches over* (8^{6}) a people and over men, That no snare of the people reign" (מן in מִמֹּקְשֵׁי partitive, as מִימֵי, 27^{6} n.). Be.[K] prps. יִפְקֹד for יחד; so St.: [Richter אחד for יחד (אדם אחד = individual, and conjecturally prefixes to [29c] והוא יפקד במישרים; *But* (whatever may seem to be the case, [29a. b]) *he* visiteth in equity, Both nations and individuals].

[אדם] commonly understood by modern interpreters to denote here the *individual* in antithesis to גוי, *a nation* (see last n.), though 𝔙 *super gentes et super omnes homines* (cp. Du. as cited in last n.) treats אדם יחד as a larger *community* than גוי. אדם, properly a collective, so far retained in Hebrew its original character that it never developed a pl. (ct. Phœn. אדמם), individuals of the human race being commonly indicated by בן אדם, pl. בני אדם, as individuals of the bovine kind were indicated by בן בקר, בני בקר. Nevertheless the sing. אדם does at times refer not to the race, but to individuals of it, and may sometimes be

idiomatically rendered in English by ***any one***: see, *e.g.*, Lv. 1^{2} 13^{2}. It is, however, a different matter for this properly collective term to express the idea of the individual ***in contrast to*** a collectivity such as nation; and the dubious nature of the Hebrew text, and the scarcely less dubious emendations hitherto proposed, leave it doubtful whether על גוי ועל אדם is the original text, and, if so, whether it means ***towards a nation or towards an individual***.]

31–32. "For did one (ever) say to ***God*** (emph.), I have borne (punishment), without offending (so Ew. Hengst. Di. Reuss: Rashi, Ges. ***I will not offend***; but in this case עוד would be expected): Beyond (that which) I see, do ***thou*** teach me; If I have done unrighteousness, I will do it no more." הֶאָמַר is, of course, the pf. with ה *interrog.*: אֶל־אֵל is prefixed for emphasis, cp. (also before הֲ) Neh. 13^{27} לָכֶם הֲנִשְׁמַע, Jer. 22^{15}, and (before כי) Is. $28^{15.\,18}$, Mic. 5^{4}, (before למה) 1 S. 20^{8b}. The subj. of אמר is הָאֹמֵר (21^{22} 30^{24}: see G–K. 144*e*). [Other interpretations of the v. really require הֶאָמַר to be differently punctuated, or emended: הָאֹמֵר, Θ, Du. (see below); אֱמֹר (Reiske, Ley); להאמר (Bi.); פִּי אֶל אלֹהַ אמר (Be.[K] (alt.), Richter; cp. 𝔖 ܡܛܠ ܕܠܐܠܗܐ ܐܡܪ.]

לא אחבל] = ***without offending***: cf. Ps. 26^{1}, Lv. 1^{17} (Dr. 162). חָבַל, in late Heb., is to ***deal corruptly, harm, offend*** (Neh. 1^{7} †); elsewhere in OT of ***material*** ruin or destruction; cf. 17^{1}; also Aram. חַבֵּל, to ***hurt, destroy***, Dn. 4^{20} 6^{23}, Ezr. 6^{12} †, Hithp. to ***be destroyed***, Dn. 2^{44} 6^{27} 7^{14} †; חֲבוּלָא, Dn. 6^{23} ***harm*** (of an ***offence*** against a king). [Richter לא אחוה with אשמתי for נשאתי.]

בלעדי אחזה] ***apart from*** (Gn. 41^{44}): for the *st. c.* before a rel. cl., with ellipse of ***that which***, cf. Jer. 2^{8}, Ps. 65^{6} (G–K. 130*d*). 𝔊 (Θ) *ἄνευ ἐμαυτοῦ* (בִּלְעָדַי) *ὄψομαι, σὺ δεῖξόν μοι*. Du. Be., however, emend the verses so as to make them contain a confession of sin: כִּי אֶל־אֵל הָאֹמֵר (אֶל־אֱלֹהַּ אָמַר or Be.) נָשָׂאתִי (הִתְנַשֵּׂאתִי .Be) לֹא אחבל עוֹד: אחזה (אִם חָטָאתִי Be. after 𝔙 si erravi) אתה ת׳: If (there is) one that saith to God, "I have lifted myself up, I will no more deal corruptly; I see it (*i.e.* I see that I have sinned, and deserve punishment, but admitting that he 'does not know if אחזה is right': Be. If I have sinned), do ***thou*** teach me (*sc.* how I may escape the consequences of my

sin), If I have done unrighteousness, I will do it no more." According to Du., in 31a יֵשׁ must be either understood or inserted; but in either case כִּי אֶל־אֵל הֶאָמַר is extraordinary Heb. for "If one saith to God": in אחבל בלעדי, בל is dittographed, and עדי yields עד.

33. "Is he to recompense thee according to *thy* (emph.) judgment, that thou refusest it (art dissatisfied with what He *does* do)? (I say this), for *thou* must choose, and not I (who am satisfied); Say, then, what thou knowest" (*i.e.* propose a juster system of recompense)! So Di. Del. Bu. מעמך: cf. עִם = *in the mind* or *judgment of* (9^{35} 10^{13} 27^{11}); and מֵעִם, Gn. 41^{32} and 2 S. 3^{28} נקי אנכי וממלכתי מֵעִם י״י עד עולם מִדְּמֵי אבנר.

ישלמנה] the fem. sf., with the force of a neuter, referring to an object understood from the context (cp. Nu. 23^{19}, 1 S. 11^{2}; and see G–K. 135*p*): Bu. Du. Be. יְשַׁלֵּם. An obj. of מָאַסְתָּ is much desiderated: Bi.[1], cleverly, כִּי דְרָכֶיו אֵל מאסת. Du. Be.[T] (Be.[K] "sed l. prb. 𝔐") (Be.[T] עֲצָתוֹ or מִשְׁפָּטוֹ) המעמך יְשַׁלֵּם כי מָאַס תַּאֲוָתוֹ "Shall he on thy account [?] recompense, that he refuse (*Dass er verwürfe*: but ? for כִּי מָאַס) his (the penitent sinner of 31, according to Du.'s view of that v.) desire (to be forgiven)?" Against the sense of מעמך; and otherwise far-fetched. [Richter places ומה ידעת דבר before המעמך, and supplies the words with a parallel line הֲרָאֵה להשפט אתי, treating the distich thus obtained as the conclusion of the disputant's challenge to God (begun in 31b). The remainder of 33 (from המעמך to ולא־אני) contains Elihu's comment on the challenge: here Richter reads ישלם for ישלמנה and אדני for אני; and renders, Appear to dispute with me, And say what thou knowest; Must he according to thy judgment repay (das Regiment führen), if something does not please thee, So that thou shouldest choose and not the Lord. Highly conjectural, and אדני is against the usage of the book, excepting in 28^{28}. The last objection could be avoided by reading (with Ley) אֵל for אני.]

35. הַשְׂכֵּיל] with ‑ֵי as Jer. 3^{15} (G–K. 53*k*). Here an inf. abs. Hif., with the force of a substantive, as Jer. 3^{15} (unless רְעוּ be read), and הַמְשֵׁל, Jb. 25^{2} (see *n*.). בהשכּיל (Olsh. § 191*c*, p. 359, Bu. Du.) is not an improvement.

36. אָבִי†] if correct (as אָבִי, my *father* (𝔙 pater mi), is out of the question), can be explained, it seems, only as by Wetzst. (see his long note in Del. *ad loc.*) as 1 impf. sg. from Arab. *bayya*, properly to *come in*, especially as a *refugee* or *suppliant* (= Heb. גֵּר: cf. دخل ; دخيل), and then to *entreat*; in common use in the Ḥauran in this sense (pf. *bît*, *bînā*, *I*, *we*, *have entreated*; impf. *yebî*, *tebî*, *tabîn* (fem.), *abî*; plur. *yebû*, *yaben* (fem.), *tebû*, *taben* (fem.), *nebî*: his collection of Ḥauran poems, says Wetzst., contains many examples of these forms). If this explanation is right, אבי will mean here, *I pray* (God) that Job may be tried. But the explanation would be more satisfactory if to *entreat* were not (as appears to be the case) a relatively modern dialectical sense of *bayya*. [בִּי, in בי אדני, is explained by Wetzst. from the same √: properly, *an entreaty to my lord!* = I pray my lord (cf. *Lex.* 106*a*, *b*), but is otherwise explained by Köhler in *ZATW*, 1916, 26 f.; cp. *ib.* 216.] A wish is also expressed by 𝔗, רְעֵינָא מִן דְּאַבָּא דְּבִשְׁמַיָּא יִבְחַן אִיּוֹב (with a double rendering of אָבִי), or, according to another reading, צְבֵינָא דְיִתְבְּחַר אִיּוֹב; and if we emend with Perles אִם (*If only* . . . as Ps. 139^{19}). 𝔊 *οὐ μὴν δὲ ἀλλὰ* (*μάθε Ἰώβ*), whence Hi. אֲבָל (= *howbeit*, as in late Hebrew as Dn. 10$^{7.21}$, see *Lex.*), Sgf. Bi. אֻלָם (as 2^{5} 5^{8} al.); 𝔖 ܒܩܘܫܛܐ, *of a truth*, whence Mich. Bu. ("possibly") אָכֵן (32^{8}); Grä. אָמְנָם. Bu. om. אבי (so Oo. Grimme, St.) as dittographed from ^{35a} איוב. Du. (after 𝔊 *μάθε*) יִזָּהֵר for יבחר: Ah (assuming אבי to be a particle expressing a wish), that Job would *let himself be warned* for ever!

על תשובות באנשי און] There are many cases in which ב has the force of *in the capacity of* = *as* (*Lex.* ב, 7a, p. 88), and some (*ib.* 7d) in which (unless כ should be read) it denotes *in the form of*, *as* in a comparison, Ps. 37^{20} and 102^{4} כלו בעשן (but כעשן, Is. 51^{6}); but this passage ("by reason of answers *in the capacity of* naughty men") and 36^{14} go beyond these; and it is better to read כאנשי by reason of answers *like* (those of) naughty men (כ pregnant as in Ps. 18^{34}, Is. 29^{4} 63^{2}: *Lex.* 455*a*); so 2 MSS, Ol. Be. St. (𝔊 *ὥσπερ* can hardly be cited for כ: RV. reads 'כ, but still has *like*!). [תשובות as 21^{34}; but the absence of the suffix here is sus-

picious.] 𝔊 for על תשובת, *μὴ δῷς ἀνταπόκρισιν* = אַל־תָּשֵׁב; 𝔖 ܠܐ ܡܬܚܫܒ = וְאַל־יִתְחַשֵּׁב; 𝔙 ne desinas = אל־תִּשְׁבֹּת; 𝔗 as 𝔐. Grä. after 𝔖 ואל־יתחשב, "and *let him not be reckoned among* naughty men" which, as Bu. remarks, would follow well after Du.'s יָזֵר in [a].

37. בינינו יספק] *sc.* כַּפָּיו, as 27[23] (שׂפק), Nu. 24[10], La. 2[15] (כַּפַּיִם), which, as the v. is very short, is probably, with Bu., to be inserted after יספק. Ley, Be.[K] St. omit the two words *m. c.* [they are perhaps a gloss on v.[23]; Bi. Du. omit also פשׁע; but [a] is rhythmically better with than without 'פ].

וְיֶרֶב] cf. on 33[21].

CHAPTER XXXV.

2. הזאת] זאת points on to [3] . . . כי. חשב ל, as 33^{10} 13^{24} al. אמרת צדקי מֵאֵל] (Or) sayest thou, "My righteousness is more than God('s)"? so Del.; and Ew. substantially, but treating אמרת as a subordinate circ. cl., "*thinking* that . . ." Di. Bu. Du. "Or callest thou it, 'My righteousness before [מן, 4^{17} n.] God'? that," etc.: אמרת (which does not by itself mean *call*) for (or לָהּ) אמרת לו; [cp. נאמר ל, *to be called*, Is. 4^{3} 19^{18} 61^{6}]; the ellipse, however, makes the construction hard. [On either view the style is awkward and כי תאמר . . . אמרת is scarcely an elegance.] 𝔊 (*δίκαιός εἰμι*), 𝔖𝔗𝔙 (iustior sum), *i.e* (unless the VV. paraphrase) צָדַקְתִּי; so Ol. Be.

3. יסכן] cf. 15^{3} 22^{2}.

לך] indirect narration (without כי) after מה: cf. 22^{17b}, Ps. 64^{6}; and see G-K. 157*a*. The indirect changes here into the direct narration (אעיל): the opposite change in 19^{28} 𝔐 22^{17b} 𝔐 [with מה אעיל, cp. מה נועיל, 21^{15}]. Grä. Du. Be. St. Bu. לִי.

מחטאתי] *more than my* (hypothetical) *sin* = more than if I had sinned: cf. Ps. 18^{24}. Perhaps (Bu.) מֵחֲטֹאתִי (the inf. as Ezk. $33^{12\ \text{end}}$). [Ehrlich avoids these rather doubtful locutions by reading in [3b] מה אֶפְעַל אם חָטָאתִי, cp. 7^{20}; but is this probable before v.[6]?]

4. אשיבך מלין] In prose השיב פ' דָּבָר (1 K. $12^{6.9.16}$ al.).

ואת רעיך] [𝔊 ואת שלשת רעיך: cp. 32^{3} (if רעיו and not אנשים is original there). Be.[T] prefers רֵעַ, *thought: and thy thoughts with thee*].

5. שחקים] [36^{28} $37^{18.21}$ (all Elihu): in Job elsewhere only 38^{37}].

6. מה־תפעל־בו] presupposing תִּפְעַל (G-K. 64*c*), though the form in use is always יִפְעַל, etc. Rd., probably, תִּפְעַל.

בר] stronger than לו (7^{20} 22^{17}), [which is read here by 2 MSS: cp. 𝔖 ܥܠܘܗܝ].

8. 𝔙 supplies, for the sense, in [a] *nocebit*, in [b] *adiuvabit*: so EVV.

9. עשׁוּקים] the pl. in an intensive sense (G–K. 124*e*), as Am. 3^9. [But a personal term עשׁוקים (MS[Ken. 368]; cp. Jer. 22^3) is suggested by the ‖ in [b], so 𝔊𝔗 ΘΣ 𝔙.]

יזעיקו] "Whether this is rightly distinguished as Hif. (for 'to raise a cry' (G–K. 53*d*), so only here), we must leave to the linguistic feeling of the scribe who inserted the י" (Bu.).

רבים] רבים so constantly means "many" that it could hardly have suggested the idea of *great men*; it is doubtful (in the sense *grandævi*) even in 32^9; and in the sg. though used with collectives (as עם, קהל, צבא), it is otherwise very rare (מלך רב, Ps. 48^3), except where it = *chief*, *chief officer*, as רב טבחים (in Jer. and 2 K. 25 for the earlier שר טבחים of Gn.), רַבֵּי מלך בבל, Jer. 39^{13} (*Lex.* 913). If correct, it is thus in any case an unusual sense. Hence Bu. ("perhaps"), Be. Nichols, רָעִים (as [12]); or כַּבִּירִים (as 34^{24}).

10. אָמַר . . . עֹשָׂי] so 𝔊 (with *με* in [11]) 𝔗𝔙: 𝔖 . . . אָמְרוּ עֹשֵׂינוּ; so Bu. Oo. St. The change does not seem necessary: in [10] an individual (חָאמַר: G–K. 144*e*) speaks for himself; in [11] he says what is applicable to himself only as one among other men.

11. מַלְּפֵנוּ] = מְאַלְּפֵנוּ (G–K. 68*k*), and probably an error for it. 𝔊 ὁ διορίζων με, whence Klo. מַפְלֵנוּ, who *distinguishes us from*," etc., which "deserves consideration" (Bu), and may be right.

יחכמנו . . . ו] Dr. 117; G–K. 116*x*.

12. שׁם] [some (cp. Bu.) postulate a temporal sense (cp. ثَمَّ) for שׁם here, as in 23^7; *Lex.* does not recognize the meaning, and it is strange that if, in Hebrew as in Arabic, the particle was temporal, this meaning should be so slightly and doubtfully attested: G.–B. cite for it Ps. 14^5 35^{13} 66^6 132^{17}, but in Ps. 132^{17} the sense is clearly local; in the remaining passages, as in these passages in Job, the temporal sense, if

established, would be the more natural; though here in particular Kö. (iii. 373*k*) feels that שם approaches an *inferential* force].

[ולא יענה] Du. (cp. Peake) thinks this clause should, if the v. be in place, stand at the end of the v.; but since such a transposition would entirely destroy the balance of the v., it cannot be regarded as a solution of the difficulties suggested by the awkwardness of the style (see above). If this is to be improved, it should rather be by emendation of [b], so that it yields a natural reason for ולא יענה; רעי[ה]ם, *because of the pride of their thoughts* (or, *purposes*: Ps. $139^{2.17}$), would be easy, but not altogether satisfactory.]

13. [ישורנה] שוא is masc.: rd. probably ישורנו (Du. Oo. St. Bu. Be.[K] alt.). Bi. Du. ("perhaps") Be.[K] alt. insert שְׂפַת before שוא (cf. שְׂפַת אָוֶן, Pr. 17^4); but the more general שוא is preferable. Ley, Be.[T] אך שַׁוְעָתָם.

14. [אַף כי] = how much less, when . . . (*Lex.* [*s.v.* אַף 2]), as Ezk. 15^5: so "how much more, when . . . ," Pr. 21^{27}, 2 S. $4^{10f.}$; cp. ואַף כי, 1 S. 23^3, 2 K. 5^{13}; Hi. Del. here and in Neh. 9^{18} take אַף כי as = yea, when [*Lex. s.v.* אַף כי].

[תשורנו] "(that) thou beholdest him not." Indirect nar., as [8a]. [The closeness of תשורנו to ישורנה is a little suspicious; but ישורני (Bi.) would be equally so, and would find very precarious support in the καὶ σώσει με of 𝔊's paraphrase of [13. 14].]

[דין] Perl. Du. (taking the words as Elihu's) Be. St. דּוֹם, *Be still* (= be resigned), for דִּין, as Ps. 37^7 דום ליהוה (|| והתחולל לו).

[ותחולל לו] חוֹלֵל (from חול) only here to *wait*, hence Bu. Be. either וְהִתְחוֹלֵל לו (Ps. 37^7) or (from √ יחל) וְתוֹחֵל or וּתְיַחֵל. However, the Hithp. means to *wait* only in Ps. 37^7; the Qal has the same meaning, Jg. 3^{25}, Mic. 1^{12}: so we can hardly be sure that the Po'lel had not the same meaning as well.

15. [ועתה כי־אַיִן פָּקַד אַפּוֹ] The pointing and accentuation of אַיִן show that the punctuators made two clauses of the line, understanding some word after אין; and had no intention of adopting the impossible construction of connecting אַיִן and פָּקַד. 𝔗 וכדון ארום בְּאִלּוּ לָא הוה אסער רוגזיה (and now, because (it is) as if he were not, his anger visiteth); cf. Ibn Ezra, והענין בשביל שאין

לו רעת לאיוב פקד אפו . . . ויש אומרים בעבור שלא התחוללת לו פקד אפו עליך: Kimchi, יש אומרים כְּאַיִן הוא מַה־שֶּׁפָּקַד ה׳ אפו על איוב לנגד חטאותיו; AV., But now, because (it is) not (so), etc. Del. in vain attempts to defend the connection of אַיִן and פָּקַד by the analogy of Arab. *laisa*, which is sometimes followed by a finite verb (with examples quoted from Fleischer); אַיִן פָּקַד, taken thus together, are simply impossible Hebrew. Di. (as Ew. *Comm.*), because it is not (the case that)—or (as Ew. § 321*b*), because there is not (aught that)—his wrath hath punished: but both these renderings imply an un-Hebraic construction; and the second would, by analogy, require (before a rel. clause) אֵין. אין is never simply "nothing." 𝔊 (Θ) (*οὐκ ἔστιν ἐπισκεπτόμενος ὀργὴν αὐτοῦ*), Σ (*ἐπιλογιζόμενος*), Hi. Sgf. Bu. Be. כִּי אֵין פֹּקֵד אפו, because his anger punishes not. The sense thus produced is quite satisfactory: but, though אֵין with a sf. is common before a ptcp. (as Ex. 5^{10}), and אֵין followed by a subst. and a part. also occurs (as Ex. 33^{15}, Lv. 14^{21} וְאֵין יָדוֹ מַשֶּׂגֶת), there is no parallel for the ptcp. *preceding* the subst., and כִּי אֵין אַפּוֹ פֹּקֵד must be read. Grä. כְּאַיִן. [Another grammatical possibility of 𝔐 is that אפו, *his* (*i.e.* Job's, 18^4) anger, is *obj.* of פקד; but alike whether we point אֵין פקד, there is none that punisheth, or read אֵינוּ פ׳, He (God) punisheth not, his anger, this yields no sense suitable to the context.]

ולא ידע בַּפַּשׁ מאד] ידע ב׳, to know *about*, as Ps. 31^8 (perhaps), Jer. 38^{24}. פַּשׁ† is explained by Del., most precariously, as meaning *arrogance*, lit. *overflowing*, from the Arab. *fashsha*, the primary meaning of which is *assumed* to be to *overflow*. The *actual* meanings are, however, very different, to *make the wind come forth* from a milk-skin, to *belch*, *utter calumnies*, etc.; see Freytag, *s.v.*; Lane, 2399*c*–2400*c*, to say nothing of the sibilant being wrong. No doubt, with 𝔊 (Θ) Σ 𝔙, and most moderns, פֶּשַׁע should be read. Cocceius, Ew. (if פשע is not to be read with 𝔊), Hrz. Bu. *folly*, from √ פשׁשׁ (cf. Ar. *fasis*, *weak* in mind and body). [פשע is certainly more probable than פש; but the text as emended, and with אפו פקד for א׳ פ׳ (see last n.) still suffers under an objection to 𝔐, viz. that מאד in ᵇ with either פשע or פש weakens the sense; we expect not "he knoweth not *much*," but "he knoweth *nothing at all* about

transgression." It would be easy, but not very attractive, to read אדם for מאד; Richter avoids the difficulty otherwise, but also unattractively; he retains ᵃ, and in ᵇ reads ולא יֵדַע בְּפֶשׁ (כפשׁ, as La. 3^{16}): And now because it is not so (viz. that you wait patiently for God), his anger hath visited, and he hath caused him that is without knowledge to cower.]

16. הבל] adv. accus. (as 9^{29} 21^{34}) = *emptily*.

יפצה פיהו] פצה פה, as Jg. $11^{35.36}$ (to make a vow; cf. Ps. 66^{14} אשר פצו שפתי), Ps. 22^{14}, La. 2^{16} 3^{46} (in derision), Ezk. 2^{8} (to eat), Is. 10^{14} (of a bird); fig. of the earth, Gn. 4^{11}, Nu. 16^{30} (‖ Dt. 11^{6}) †.

יַכְבִּר] See on 8^{2}. 𝕲 (Θ)Σ erroneously יְכַבֵּד.

CHAPTER XXXVI.

2. כַּתַּר†] an Aramaism: in 𝕿 Levy quotes only this passage and Is. 42^{4}, and in the Afel (as pointed) Is. 51^{6}, Mic. 5^{6}; but in Syr. ܟܬܪ is very common (Ex. 14^{13}, Is. 8^{17} etc.).

זְעֵיר] Is. $28^{10.13}$†: probably a diminutive form (G–K. § 86*g*, n. (the Engl. transl.); cf. Dr. on 2 S. 13^{20}).

ואחוך] 15^{17} n.

לאלוה] 𝔊 *ἐν ἐμοί*: Bi.[1] Grä. Du. St. insert לִי before לאלוה, Bi.[2] בִּי. [For the force of the ל in לאלוה, which even in 𝔐 is not that of possession, cp. 13^{7}. Hoffm. unnecessarily and improbably לאליהוא.]

3. דֵּעִי] see on 32^{6}. [Hoffm. רֵעִי: improbable.]

לְמרחוק] 39^{29}, 2 S. 7^{19} (= 1 Ch. 17^{17}), 2 K. 19^{25} (= Is. 37^{26}); עד למרחוק, 2 Ch. 26^{15}, Ezr. 3^{13}†. On the use of לְמִן (with pleon. ל) see, further, *Lex.* 583*b*. [Here, as clearly in 2 K. 19^{25} and (cp. the ‖ משם) in c. 39^{29} למרחוק = *from* afar, not *to* afar (so Del. here): for למן in other phrases meaning *from*, see, *e.g.*, Dt. 4^{32}, Jg. 20^{1}.]

פֹּעֲלִי] "my Maker": so only here (cf., however, the vb. Pr. 16^{4}). 𝔊 *ἔργοις δέ μου* (= לְפָעֳלִי)! [cp. Fried. Del. "meine Handlungsweise"].

אתן צדק] נתן, to *ascribe* [1^{22} n.], as in נתן כבוד, נתן עֹז.

4. [תמים] 𝔊 *συνιείς*, whence King (*JThSt.* xv. 80), מֵבִין.]

דֵּעוֹת] the pl. intensive [as 1 S. 2^{3}; אמונות, Pr. 28^{20}; בינות, Is. 27^{11}; תבונות, Is. 40^{14}. See G–K. 124*e*].

5. כביר] of God, as 34^{17}: for the word, see 8^{2} n. [𝔊 omits כביר ו.]

כביר כח לב] So Θ. The asyndeton (which equates strangely כביר כח לב with ᵃ כביר), the shortness of the line, and

the expression "strength of heart" (*i.e.* of understanding), all point, however, to some fault in the text. Bu. כביר כח וַחֲכַם לב, "mighty in strength, and *wise in* heart" (so 𝔗: cf. 9^{4} חֲכַם לבב ואמיץ כח; also 37^{24}), removing at once all these difficulties [but producing the rhythm 4 : 4 which is very rare in Job (21^{28} n.)]. Du. remarks, "כביר ולא and כביר לב are variants, and כח a scribal error for לב, which has been suffered to remain; as כביר לב does not occur elsewhere, it is more prudent to read כְּבַד לֵב (Ex. 9^{7})"; and so reads for $^{5-7a}$ (making two distichs of them) חן אֵל ימאס כְּבַד לֵב לא יחיה רשע: ומשפט עניים יִתֵּן לא יגרע צֶדֶק מֵעֲנָו: (so Be.^{K} St. for ^{5}, and as alt. for ^{7a}); but וְלֹא is now also needed in ^{6a} and ^{7a} [and was so read perhaps in ^{6a} by 𝔊—note δέ in $^{12.17}$ 𝔊]. [Another way of recovering the original text is suggested by 𝔊. $^{6-11}$ in editions of 𝔊 are Θ, and thus ^{5} and ^{12} represent continuous lines in 𝔊: the two lines $^{6b.\,7a}$ appear in 𝔊 (though separated from one another and from ^{5}), viz. ^{6b} in ^{15b} 𝔊, ^{7a} in ^{17a} 𝔊. Bringing together the separated lines, 𝔊's rendering of $^{5.6}$ reads (*γίγνωσκε δὲ ὅτι*):

> ^{5} *ὁ κύριος οὐ μὴ ἀποποιήσηται τὸν ἄκακον,*
> ^{12a} *ἀσεβεῖς δὲ οὐ διασώζει·*
> ^{15b} *κρίμα δὲ πραέων ἐκθήσει,*
> ^{17} *οὐχ ὑστερήσει δὲ ἀπὸ δικαίων κρίμα:*

this represents

> ^{5} אל לא ימאס תמים
> ^{6} ולא יחיה רשע(ים)
> ומשפט עניים יתן
> ^{7} ולא ינרע מצדיק(ים) משפט (דין or)

In point of rhythm and parallelism, and in providing an obj. for ימאס in ^{5}, this is certainly preferable to 𝔐. With the first of these distichs, cp. 8^{20}. In ^{5} *τὸν ἄκακον* = תמים (not rendered by 𝔊 in ^{4}, where *ἀδίκως συνιεὶς* probably represents רעות עמך) rather than (cp. Nichols) ברי לב (cp. כביר כח לב in 𝔐); *κρίμα* in 𝔊 ^{17} = 𝔐 ^{7} should, according to the usage of 𝔊 in Job generally, and in 𝔊^{15b} = 𝔐 ^{6b} in particular, = משפט; but possibly it represents דין (adopted by Bi.: al. דינו), for *κρίμα* is = דינא in Dn. 7^{22}, Ezr. 7^{26}. If 𝔊 read משפט, this should be explained as

the incorrect repetition of a parallel term (8[3] n.), and עיניו would have the stronger claim to be the original reading.]

6. יתן] absolutely, =*grant*: Dt. 24[15], Gn. 30[18], Ps. 61[6].

7a. יגרע] cf. 15[4.8]. [The Qal (𝔐) is preferable here to the Nif. (𝔊: cp. Nu. 9[7]).]

מצדיק] Bu., in accordance with [c] and v.[8ff.] מצדיקים. An improvement; [Du. צֶדֶק with מֵעָנוּ for עיניו].

[עיניו] 𝔊 (in v.[17], *not* v.[15] as suggested in Be.[K]) κρίμα = משפט, or דין (see on v.[6] at the end).]

7b. לכסא] ל, on account of the motion implied in וישיבם; so Ps. 9[5] ישבת לכסא, Is. 3[26] לארץ תשב, 47[1] al.

וַיּשׁיבם] the ו by Dr. 127*a* (cf. Jer. 6[19], 1 K. 9[20f.] 15[18], 2 S. 4[10], 1 Ch. 28[5], Dn. 1[20]). Du. Be.[K] וְאִם (rendering: [7b] And though kings were (?) on the throne, Whom he seated (יֹשִׁיבֵם,—without ו) in glory (1 Ch. 29[11]), so that they become proud, [8] Yea, though they were bound in fetters, (and) were taken in cords of affliction, [9] He would (?) declare, etc. [the writer having in mind such stories as those of Manasseh (1 Ch. 33[10ff.]), or Nebuchadnezzar's pride, fall, and restoration].

8. ואם אסורים] the subj. (the צדיק[ים] of [7a]) is not expressed: we should expect ואם אסורים הֵם. Bu. St. ואם אֲסָרָם: cf. [18b].

9. וַיַּגֵּד] Di. Hi. Del. Bu. make the apod. begin here (Ew. not till [11b] [; but this would have the effect of giving a different character to the two similarly constructed vv.[11.12]]); for the ו in that case, see Dr. 127γ (Ps. 59[16] after אם; cf. Ex. 16[24], Nu. 1[19] after כאשר, 1 S. 15[23] after יַעַן, Is. 45[4] after למען al.: cf. also [7b] above). Bu. וְיַגֵּד.

9. [On the form of parallelism in this v., see Gray, *Forms of Hebrew Poetry*, 78 ff.]

כי יתגברו] *that* they behave themselves proudly (15[25]), explaining wherein פעלם and פשעיהם consist.

10. וַיּגל . . . וַיֹּאמר] Bu. וְיגל . . . וְיֹאמר.

כי ישובון] expressing the obj. of ויאמר, "And saith to them (= commandeth them, as in Arab.; cf. 9[7], and *Lex.* 56*b*) *that they return* from iniquity": cf. Arab. *amara an*. So not un-

frequently in late Heb., after verbs expressing a desire or command, where the earlier language would use a *direct* expression (Ew. § 136*g*; Dr. 39β *end*): Neh. 2^{5} 7^{65} $8^{14.\,15}$ $13^{1.\,19}$ וְאָמְרָה אשר לא יִפָּתְחוּם, v.[22], Est. 2^{10} (all with אשר instead of כי, in the manner of these later writers: *Lex.* 83*b*); contrast especially 1 Ch. 21^{18} לאמר כִּי יַעֲלֶה with the earlier ‖, 2 S. 24^{18} ויאמר לו עֲלֵה.

11. וְיִכְלוּ] *c.* 70 MSS יִכְלוּ; cf. on 21^{18}. יִכְלוּ is preferable.

'ושניהם וג] om. Du. Be.[K] St. *m. c.*

בנעימים] as Ps. 16^{6}; the masc. pl. = *amœna*: cf. חֲרֵרִים, Jer. 17^{6}; חֲשֵׁכִים, Is. 50^{10} (Ew. § 172*b*), though the fem. pl. is more common, G–K. 122*q*.

12. בשלח יעברו] the expression, as 33^{18b} (see *n.*). Du. as there בִּשְׁאֹלָה. [But here בשלח stands *before* יעברו (ct. 33^{18}); for this emphatic position there seems to be no reason. Since, further, v.[11a] is over-short and [12a] over-long, בשלח may be a displaced, and then, of course, a corrupt, complement to ישמעו in [11a]; we think most naturally of בקלו; cp., especially, Pr. 5^{13} in its whole context, and in particular in its near neighbourhood to שנאת־ימוסר and לא המיתי אזני (cp. here in v.[10] ויגל אזנם למוסר). After בקלו had slipped down from its original position between ישמעו and יעברו in v.[11] to its present position between ישמעו and יעברו in v.[12], and had become partially illegible, the word was wrongly completed by some scribe who remembered the phrase in 33^{18}. Less satisfactory, as only half meeting the rhythmical difficulty and not explaining the position of שלח at all, is Be.[K]'s tentative suggestion to omit ישמעו in [12a]. Ehrlich in [11] omits יכלו, and for ויעבדו reads יעברו with ימיהם as its subject, and in [12] בשחת for בשלח; but this leaves [12a] too long, and reduces [11] to rhythmical chaos. With the assonance in ויעבדו and יעברו at the end of corresponding lines in a pair of similarly constructed distichs, cp. תֹּאבוּ, תְּאֻכְּלוּ in Is. $1^{19f.}$. For the vb. עבד of service to God used without a personal obj., cp. Is. $19^{21.\,23}$; also Jer. 2^{20}, where אעבור was probably intended to suggest at once the meaning (cp. 39^{9}) suited to the figure of the first part of the v., and the religious meaning which would form a transition to the last part.]

בבלי דעת] 35^{16} 36^{12}.

13. ישימו אף] a singular, "very artificial" (Di.) expression. שִׂים, without any specification of the place where the object is to be "placed," is vague and ambiguous. The most probable view is that of Ges. (*Thes.* 1325*a*) "*reponere* tanquam in thesauro (Syr. ܣܡ ܣܝ̈ܡܬܐ, *reposuit thesauros*" (PS. 2563: a common expression, Ro. 2^5, Sir. 3^4, etc., used abs. *e.g.* ܣܝܡܝܢ ܣܝ̈ܡܬܐ, Bar. 3^{17}; hence here) "*reponunt* (in corde) *iram*, *i.e.* apud se custodiunt, servant iram, iræ et invidiæ indulgent, non ad Deum pie se convertunt," *lay up*, *cherish*; so also Di. (who compares 22^{22} שים אמריו בלבבך, Pr. 26^{24} ובקרבו ישית מרמה, Ps. 13^3; see also Jer. 9^7 ובקרבו ישים ארבו) Del. Bu. Cf. Du. "בְּלִבָּם must be understood (cf. Ps. 13^3); it is omitted, because לב has just preceded." Many older authorities understood אף of the divine anger (cf. Ro. 2^5 θησαυρίζεις σεαυτῷ ὀργὴν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ὀργῆς; so, wrongly, the RV. with marginal references); but this is against the context. [Ehrlich, *presuppose* anger in God, viz. as the cause of their sufferings.] Be.^{T} ("perhaps"), with 1 MS, יַשִּׁימוּ from נָשַׁם (Is. 42^{14} †), *make to breathe forth* (?); cf. 𝔙 *provocant iram*.

14. תָּמֹת] of course, the poet cannot have intended a jussive in *sense*: 18 MSS have תָּמוּת, which must, no doubt, be read.

נֹּעַר] 33^{25}, Ps. 88^{16}, Pr. 29^{21} †.

חַיָּתָם] see on 33^{18}.

בקדשים] *among* (so Ew.) the קְדֵשִׁים, *i.e.* sharing the same lot that they do. ב in the sense of *in the capacity of*, *as* (v. on 34^{36}) is not probable here; and 𝔗 בִּקְדֵשִׁים may be merely a paraphrase. 𝔊 has the extraordinary rendering ἡ δὲ ζωὴ αὐτῶν τιτρωσκομένη ὑπὸ ἀγγέλων (= קְדֹשִׁים; cf. 𝔊 5^1). [Hitz. בשקדים, *the early ripe*. The rhythm, 3 : 2, is suspicious; cp. 17^{14} n.]

15. וְיִגֶל] cp. 13^{27} n. 15^{33} n. 20^{28} n. 33^{21} 34^{37}.

אזנם] 𝔙 Bu. Du. Be. אָזְנוֹ, to agree with עָנִי and בְּעָנְיוֹ. Still, the עני is typical of a class.

16. ואף] If the v. introduces the application of [15] to Job's

case, rd., with Bi.[1] Bu. Be.^{T}, ואף אַתְּ, "And as for thee, also"; if (see below) it introduces, in an adversative sense, what has *not* happened in Job's case, read, with Hirz. Du. Oo. Be.^{K} St. וְאַתְּ (for וְאַף), "But, as for thee." Bi.[1] very cleverly suggests that לִרְוָחָה (Ex. 8^{11}, Ps. 66^{12} (emended)) has fallen out after צר, before the following רחב: he thus gets two symmetrical lines: ואף אַתְּ הֲסִיתְךָ מפי צר לִרְוָחָה.

[הסיתך] the subj., according to the differing views (see last n.) of the meaning, is either (1) God (as in ^{15}), or (2) רחב . . . ונחת in ^{b} (pred. in 3 m. s. *before* the subj.: G–K. 145*o*). Of these (1) is unlikely, for הסית is so regularly used with sinister associations—of enticing to evil, or to hostile or disadvantageous action (*e.g.* v.^{18} 2^{3}, 1 S. 26^{19}, 2 S. 24^{1}, Is. 36^{18})—that it is unlikely to have been used of God leading Job to prosperity; a single example of a favourable meaning would be found in 2 Ch. 18^{31} if the text there could be trusted; in Jos. 15^{18} = Jg. 1^{14} the associations are neutral. But (2) is scarcely more probable, for it involves a very awkward construction. Not improbably words have been lost in ^{a} which contained the subject of הסיתך, and the subject was then explicated in $^{b.\,c}$. Richter would find the subj. of הסיתך in מפצר (read instead of מפי צר)—a verbal noun from פצר (cp. 1 S. 15^{23}), but the meaning which he suggests is questionable, and the combination of מפצר, רחב, and נחת ש' incongruous.]

[מפי צר] the words may well be corrupt, but neither מְפַצִּיר (Hoffm.), as acc. of the state to ךָ— or voc., nor מפצר (see last n.) is probable.]

[רחב לא מוצק תחתיה] רַחַב, only here and 38^{18}. מוּצָק †, *constraint, straitness*, from צוק; מוּצָק 37^{10}, Is. 8^{23} †. לֹא מוּצָק, qualifying רחב = unconstrained (see on 12^{24}). In תחתיה, if correct, the sf. must refer to רַחַב, treated, in spite of its form, as a fem. (Del., who compares רְחוֹב, Dn. 9^{25}; and Ew., who compares, § 174*g*, a few other similar cases, especially in late Heb., as מְעַט, Hag. 2^{6}; עָמָל, Qoh. 10^{15}; צָבָא, Is. 40^{2}, Dn. 8^{12} (but masc. in 10^{1}); פִּתְגָם, Qoh. 8^{11}). But read probably תחתיך, with 1 MS *pr. m.*, Bi.[1] Di. ("perhaps") Bu. Oo.

[ונחת שלחנך] Ges. (*Thes.*), Del. and most (from נוּחַ),

"*that which rests* (= *is set*; die 'Besetzung') on thy table" (cf. הֵנִיחַ, *to set down*); מָלֵא will then be either (Del.) attracted to the gender of שֻׁלְחָנְךָ, or מְלֵאָה must be read: Ew. Di., however, "And the rest (*quiet* [Is. 30[15], Pr. 29[9]], *comfort*, 'Behaglichkeit') of thy table, which is (was) full of fat." Bu. omits נַחַת as an incorrect dittograph of תחתיה. 𝕲 (Θ) *καὶ κατέβη* = וַנַּחַת, yielding no sense, but testifying to the consonantal reading נחת at the time.

17. דין ומשפט יתמכו] rd. at least יִתְמְכוּךָ, if not, with Du. Be. ומשפטו תִּמְכֶךָּ (without דין, regarded as repeated by error from [a]); [but this reduces the rhythm of [17] from the normal 3 : 3 to the rare 3 : 2 (17[14] n.). Note the suspicious similarity of מלא רשע in [16], מלאת דין in [17]].

18. כי חמה] חמה prefixed to פן for emphasis. Bu., arguing that חֵמָה must denote God's wrath (21[20]), and that is out of the question in view of [b], would read, with Bi., חֹם, *heat* (fig. of severe misfortune,—"die Drangsalhitze"), or better (so in his translation) (or חֵמָה) כִּי חַם, "*Dass es heiss hergeht* darf dich nicht zum Hohnen (לִשְׂפֹּק) verführen": but this cannot be said to be probable. [Be.[K] חֲמֵה, *beware*, which would be an Aramaism: חמא, frequent in the Targums as a rendering of ראה, in mod. Syriac = *to beware* (see Nöld. *ZDMG* liv. 154).]

פן] "(Beware,) lest . . .," as 32[13].

יסיתך] the masc. after חֵמָה is very irregular: G-K. 145*u* (end): cf., however, 8[7] (where ? rd. תשגה), Pr. 2[10] 12[25] 29[25]. [If we point חֲמֵה (see last n. but one), the subj. of יסיתך will be המסית, (masc.): cp. RV.]

בְּשָׂפֶק] *into smiting* (*sc.* of the hands), *i.e. scorning*: see 27[23], and (without כפים, at least in 𝕸) 34[37] יספוק בינינו. [שׂ here for ס, as in 27[23]; if the meaning *sufficiency* (RV.) yielded sense, the שׂ would be normal: see 20[22] (n.).] Di. *at the smiting* (Divine chastisement: שפק from ספק, 34[26]), objecting that הסית ב׳ is always elsewhere to incite *against* (2[3], 1 S. 26[19] al.). Whether this objection is conclusive in such Heb. as this may be doubtful: if it is, Bu.'s לִשְׂפֹּק (*to scorn*) relieves it. [Bi. בִּשֹׂפֵק, *against the chastiser*, Du. משפק with לחמת; see at end of n. on [19].]

19. Very difficult. שׁוּעַ may mean, it seems, *opulence, riches* (so Rabb.; EVV.: cf. שׁוֹעַ, *opulent*, 34^{19}; *noble*, Is. 32^5 †; and Ar. *sa'at*ᵘⁿ, Qor. 6^{57} al.—from *wasa'a*, to *be capacious, wiae* = Heb. יָשַׁע*—properly *width, breadth, amplitude*, and so *ampleness of means, competence, wealth*; Lane, 3053*b*; cf. *Lex.* 447*b*); it may also mean (from √ שָׁוַע*, שִׁוַּע) a *cry for help* (Is. 22^5 [שׁוֹעַ?], Jb. 30^{24}—but rd. here לֹא יְשַׁוַּע, see n.): but vocalize in this sense שַׁוְעַ, שַׁוְעֲךָ (cf. שַׁוְעָה): hence, according to the sense given to the ambiguous עָרַךְ, we get: Ges. *Thes.* 1069*b* (עָרַךְ, 3, *æstimavit*, and so *magni fecit*) "*num divitias tuas magni faciet, i.e.* respiciet?" (cf. AV. Will he esteem thy riches?); Del. Bu. "Will thy cry set thee outside affliction?" (ערך (Del.) a "choice word for שִׁית, שִׂים, cf. 37^{19}"; but ?: as Di. remarks, "ערך does not mean to *set*, 'thee' is not expressed"—though, if there were no other objection, יערכך would be an easy emendation—and לא בצר is not the same as בלא צר (8^{11} 30^{28}), but can only mean *without affliction* (cf. 4^{21} 34^{20}); Di. "Will (Can) he (God) bring thy cry into order (*i.e.* make thy rebellious cry one of humility and submission), without (the use of) affliction, and all the efforts of (His) strength?" Ew. Shall thy riches set themselves in array (ערך in its military sense, 1 S. 4^2 al.)—without need, with all the forces of strength? (dost thou think to meet God with the weapons by which thou wouldest ward off a human foe?). For Du.'s view, *v.i.* Bi. הֲיַעֲרֹךְ שַׁוְעֲךָ לוֹ מאמצי־כח (Bu., better, בָּצֵר לְכֹל (מִכֹּל), "Can thy cry be set forth (cf. 32^{14}, Ps. 5^4) before Him, (Who is) cut off from (inaccessible to) all exertions of strength?" Clever, especially in ᵃ; but בָּצֵר וג׳ is improbable.

In a choice of difficulties, perhaps the best rendering is: "Will thy riches be equal (to it, *i.e.* suffice to do this: cf. RV. *suffice*) without affliction (*i.e.* suffering is indispensable), Or all exertions of strength?" ערך, as $28^{17.19}$ (sq. acc.; 28^{17} n.): an obj. is much desiderated; but יַעַרְכֶהָ (the sf. referring to the action referred to) would be a very slight change: לא בצר, as 4^{21} לא בחכמה, 34^{20} לא ביד. מאמצי כח, cf. on 9^4: מַאֲמָץ* only here.

Di. renders, as a whole (taking the passage in an unfavourable sense, of the unfortunate effects upon Job of long

prosperity): [16] and also unconstrained freedom (lit. freedom unconstrained *in its place*, תחת, as [20] 34^{26}; or, reading תחתיך, freedom without constraint *beneath thee*, 18^7, Ps. 18^{37}) hath enticed thee away from the mouth of affliction (so that thou disobeyest the voice, or warning, of misfortune), and the rest (or comfort) of thy table, which was full of fatness; [17] and if thou art full of the judgment on the wicked (viz. in the malady from which thou art suffering), judgment and sentence hold (thee) fast; [18] for let not heat (passion, resentment towards God) provoke thee at the chastening, and let not the greatness of the ransom lead thee astray; [19] can he (God) bring thy cry into order (*i.e.* make it a cry of submission), without (the use of) affliction, and all the efforts of (His) strength?

Du. [16a] וְאֹתְךָ הסיתך רַחַב ונחת מפי צָר׃ [16b] לא מוצק הֶחִתְּךָ ושלחנך מלא דשן׃ [17] ודין רשע מלאת ומשפטו תִּמְכֶךָּ׃ [18] לְחֵמָה פן יסיתך מִשְּׂפָק ורב כפר יַטֶּךָּ׃ [19] הֲיַעֲרֹךְ שִׂיחֲךָ לֹו בצָר וכל מאמצי כֹחַ׃, *i.e.* [16a] But thee freedom hath beguiled, And rest from the jaws of adversity; [16b] With no straitness that dismayed thee, And thy table full of fatness; [17] Thou art filled with the judgment of the wicked, And his judgment has taken hold upon thee; [18] (Beware) lest chastening entice thee into anger, And let not the greatness of the ransom lead thee astray; [19] Will thy complaint in distress avail against him, Or all exertions of strength? V.[16b] consists of two circ. clauses. V.[17b] דין repeated by error from [a]. מִשְּׂפָק (not actually found, though a legitimate form from שָׂפַק), *chastening*, properly *smiting*, from ספק, 34^{26}. ערך, as 37^{19}. שִׂיחַ, as 23^2.

𝔊 is here very paraphrastic, and gives no help towards the restoration of the text. For v.[19] it has: *μή σε ἐκκλινάτω* (= [18 end] אַל־יַטֶּךָ) *ἑκὼν ὁ νοῦς δεήσεως ἐν ἀνάγκῃ* (בצר) *ὄντων ἀδυνάτων* [*καὶ πάντας τοὺς κραταιοῦντας ἰσχὺν* (= וכל מַאֲמַצֵּי כח), which follows, is Θ's version of [19b]].

20. תשאף] שאף, as 7^2 (n.).

לעלות] *that* (whole) nations may *go up* (vanish as dust, etc.: Is. 5^{24} ופרחם כאבק יעלה, Ps. 102^{25} אל תעלני בחצי ימי) in their place (תחת, idiomatic, as 34^{26} n.: Dathe, Voigt מִתַּחְתָּם, *from* their place, which is an improvement). Du. אַל־תִּשְׁאַף הַלַּיְלָה לַעֲלוֹת עַם

מִתְחַכֵּם, "Let not folly (הוֹלֵלָה, Qoh. 1^{17} al.) deceive thee, To exalt thyself with him that thinketh himself wise (Qoh. 7^{16})."

21. כי עליזה בחרת מעני] בחר על does not occur: rd. probably with Bu. Du. Be. St. עַוְלָה, *unrighteousness* instead of על זה. In Aram. בחר is to *try* or *prove* (*e.g.* for צָרַף, Jg. 7^4 𝕿; for בָּחַן, Jer. 17^{10} in בֹּחֵן כְּלָיוֹת; so in 𝕾 Jer. 17^{10} and often, PS. 506 f.; cf. Is. 48^{10} Heb.); hence Dathe, Ew. "perhaps," Wr. בֹּחַרְתָּ (Pu.), For on this account (that thou mightest not turn to naughtiness) *hast thou been tried* though suffering: Di. Bu. both object that, if this were the meaning, בעני would be expected rather than מעני: however, מן does denote the efficient cause (*Lex.* 580*a*); and even if בעני were more natural, בעני for מעני would be a very slight emendation (cf. Ezk. 48^{29} where בנחלה *must* be read; and Dr. *Samuel*[2], p. lxvii).

22. ישגיב] *showeth loftiness*, *doeth loftily* (G–K. 53*d*); the Hif. only here, the Qal, 5^{11}, Dt. 2^{36} †: Bu. compares המתיק, 20^{12}, and מתק, 21^{33}; חלעיג, 21^{3} al., and לעג, 9^{23} al.; הרשיע, 34^{12}, and רָשַׁע. Be.[T] "perhaps the ב is only dittographed from the following ב, and יִשְׁנֵי = יִשְׁנֶה (^{24} n.) should be read."

מוֹרֶה] 𝕲 δυνάστης = מָרֵא, *lord* (Aram.: Dn. 2^{47} 5^{23}, and often in Nab., Talm., Egyptian-Aramaic, and Syriac): so Ew. ("Gebieter"; see also p. 340), Bi.[1] Be. Honth. But the Aramaism would be a very strong one; and (Bu.) the idea of God as a *teacher* is in accordance with the thought of Elihu elsewhere. [Ehrlich מוֹרֶה = מורא: cp. Is. 8^{13}.]

23. Cf. the very similar v., 34^{13}.

פקד על] 34^{13} n. The perfects Who ever . . . ? are quite right (34^{13}: Dr. § 9), though, of course, the impff. could be used (21^{31}). [Del. in ^{b} gives the pf. a different force: *quis dixerit* (cp. Gn. 21^7; Dr. § 19: but this is unnecessary, nor need we, retaining the pf. in ^{a}, read יאמר in ^{b} (cp. Bu.).]

24. זְכֹר כִּי] Cf. on v.^{10b}.

תשגיא] On this Aram. word (in Heb. only in Job), see on 8^7. The Hif. also in 12^{23}; but there lit. משגיא לגוים ויאבדם, here fig. to *extol*.

שֹׁרְרוּ] The intens. Po'lel form (from שִׁיר) only here. Rabb.

AV. *behold* (Po'l. from שׁור). [The pf. is the pf. of experience (Dr. § 12), as in [25a].]

25. חזו בו] look *upon*, viz. with admiration and awe.

26. שׂגיא] in Heb. only here and 37[23]: the common Aram. word for *great* (Dn. 2[6. 12. 31] etc.).

מספר שניו ולא חֵקֶר] The pred. introduced by וְ: cf. 15[17] 23[12], Ps. 115[7] (Dr. 125, *Obs.*).

27. יְגָרַע] Pi. only here. For the sense *withdraw, draw away to*, cf. Nu. 36[3. 4] (of an inheritance), v.[7] above, 15[8]: [Jacob (*ZATW*, 1912, 287) explains by جرع *to swallow, gulp, drink, sip up*; cp. *e.g.* Qor. 14[20] يتجرّعه ولا يكاد يسيغه, he shall sip it (the water) up, but with difficulty swallow it down].

נטפי־מים] Du.'s נְטָפִים מִיָּם, with the more definite מִיָּם, is a great improvement; so Honth. Be. St.

יָזֹקּוּ] זקק is to *strain*, or *filter through* (trans.), 28[1]: the subj. then will be the water-drops, which *filter* the rain *through*. But (Hfm.) יִזָּקוּ: they *are filtered through* as rain (accus. of the product), or (Du.) יָזֹק he *filters* rain *through*, or, which is best (St. Bu.), יְזַקֵּם, he *filters them through* as rain (ם dropped out before מטר).

לאדו] at the time of [לְ, as in Gn. 3[8]: see *Lex.* 516*b* (6a)] his mist (Gn. 2[6] †). Du. מֵאֵדוֹ, which gives a clearer sense (RV. also *from*, but explaining by the margin, "Heb. *belonging to*," that this is only a paraphrase. But "from" implies legitimately the *reading* מֵאֵדוֹ). Bu. *for his mist*, supposing the drops of water to be first gathered into the אֵד, which afterwards (v.[28]) forms itself into clouds, from which the drops descend as rain.

28. אשר יזלו] נזל is intrans. (Dt. 32[2] תִּזַּל אִמְרָתִי): hence אשר is accus. (G-K. 117*z*), as Jer. 9[17], Is. 45[8] with the same vb., and La. 3[48] with the synonymous ירד.

ירעפו] Cf. Pr. 3[20] ושחקים ירעפו טל; also Is. 45[8] הרעיפו שמים ממעל ושחקים יזלו צדק.

אדם רב] as עם רב Gn. 50[20] al. EVV. *abundantly*; but רָב is not an adv. Wr. Königsb. Be.[T] take רב as a by-form of רְבִיבִים, *showers* (Dt. 32[2] al.). In 𝔊 [28a] ῥυήσονται παλαιώματα

is from Θ, [28b] ἐσκίασεν δὲ νέφη ἐπὶ ἀμυθήτῳ βροτῷ agrees roughly with "[28b] and fragments of [28a], νέφη = שחקים," Be.[T]. There then follows in 𝔊 ὥραν ἔθετο κτήνεσιν, οἴδασιν δὲ κοίτης τάξιν (cf. v.[33] מקנה . . . יגיד, 37[8b]), ἐπὶ τούτοις πᾶσιν οὐκ ἐξίσταταί σου ἡ διάνοια (= 37[1a]), οὐδὲ διαλλάσσεταί σου ἡ καρδία ἀπὸ σώματος (= 37[1b]).

29. [The rhythm is suspicious—2 : 2 : 2 (see 17[1] n.), or, giving to מפרשי־עב a single stress, 3 : 2 (see 17[14] n.). Further, the resemblance of מפרשי עב to פרש על in the next v. and מפלשי עב in 37[16] are noticeable. The v. has perhaps suffered more corruption than is generally recognised.]

אף אם] אם = *Num.* ? as Jg. 5[8], Is. 29[16] etc. But 𝔖 ܡܣܬܟܠ; whence Sgf. Du. Bu. אף מִי, Be. ומִי, which is certainly more forcible than: Yea, can one understand . . . ?

מפרשי] *the spreadings of* the clouds: in Ezk. 27[7] מִפְרָשׂ denotes a *sail* (something *spread out*; cf. the √ Is. 33[23] בל־פרשו נס al.). In 37[16] we have the expression מפלשי עב (so 1 MS here).

תְּשֻׁאוֹת] ת׳ (always in the pl.) denotes various loud and harsh sounds, which we in English should express by different words: 30[22] Kt. the *roar* of a storm, Is. 22[2] the shouts or *uproar* of an excited crowd; *loud shoutings*, Jb. 39[7], Zec. 4[7] †: here we might render *crashings*.

סֻכָּתוֹ] prop. a *booth*; fig. here of the dark thunder-cloud in which, in a storm, Yahweh was supposed by the Hebrews to be shrouded. Cf. esp. Ps. 18[12] יָשֶׁת חשך סִתְרוֹ סביבותיו סֻכָּתוֹ.

30. אורו] if correct, must denote the blaze of light (not the lightning *flashes*, Bu.) which was supposed to surround Yahweh in the thunder-cloud, the נֹגַהּ נֶגְדּוֹ of Ps. 18[13]. But אֵדוֹ, *his mist*, v.[27] (Du. Bu. Be.: cf. 𝔊 (Θ) ἰδοὺ ἐκτενεῖ ἐπ' αὐτὸν ἡ ᾠδή (!), ℵ[c. a] ηδω, so also (*v.* Field) Syro-Hex. on the margin) is almost certainly to be read for אורו.

ושרשי הַיָּם כסה] "Roots of the *sea*" is an extraordinary expression, not legitimately paraphrased by the "bottom" of the sea, and the more extraordinary here, since, as God does not (in the thunder-cloud) cover Himself literally with either the "roots" or the "bottom" of the sea, it is supposed (Ew. Del. Di.) to mean *the water drawn up from* the bottom of the sea to

replenish the black, heavily laden thunder-clouds (cf. RVm. *And covereth* it (the light about Him) *with the depths* (?) *of the sea*. Such exegesis is incredible; though, if the text is correct, no other is possible; the alternative mentioned by Di., from Hrz. Schlottm. Hi., that the "roots of the sea" denoted the upper, heavenly waters—the "waters above the firmament" of Gn. 1, being, if possible, still more out of the question. Du.'s וְרָאשֵׁי הָרִים is a very plausible emendation: and he covereth (with it,—the "mist" of [a]; see above) the tops of the mountains; so Bu.[2]—abandoning the suggestion in ed. 1 to read גִּלָּה for כסה (a *lapsus calami* due to כסה in [32]), "And the roots of the sea he lays bare," comparing Ps. 18^{16a}—Be., and ("perhaps") St. J. Marshall ושרשי הים כִּסְאוֹ, "and the roots of the sea are his throne"—the "sea" being the heavenly ocean (Gn. 1^7), the roots of which "were poetically conceived to be the seven mountains which were thought to surround the earth (En. 18^8 33^2)." But the heavenly throne seems here to be out of place; for the context relates to the movements of the storm-clouds. With regard to the construction, Ew. Del. Di. make שרשי הים the direct accus., כִּסָּה being = *make into a covering*: "And *make the* שרשי הים *a covering* (*sc.* upon it—the light about him—or (Del.) upon him): but, as כִּסָּה is construed also (see on v.[32]) with an accus. defining what the covering is, RVm. (see above) would seem to be equally possible. The rendering *covers himself with* is very dubious; it is contrary to the sense of Piel, and its only support is Jon. 3^6, where prob. יְכַס or (Is. 37^1) יִתְכַּס should be read.

31. [ידין] The *ethical* purpose (ידין) comes in rather abruptly: hence Houb. Grä. Be. Bu.[2] יָזוּן, *feeds, nourishes* (Jer. 5^8 Kt. מְיֻזָּנִים †; an Aram. word, Dn. 4^9, Gn. 47^{12} 𝔗, Wis. 16^{26} 𝔖: cf. מָזוֹן, Gn. 45^{23}, 2 Ch. 11^{23} †, and in Aram. Dn. $4^{9.18}$ †).

[למכביר †] *in abundance*, which in ordinary Heb. would be expressed by לָרֹב. One of the peculiar expressions used by Elihu; the verb הכביר, 35^{16} †. The form, unusual for nouns, like משחית, destruction, משכיל: cf. (briefly) G–K. 85*m*.

32. [על כפים כִּסָּה אור] כִּסָּה, though construed mostly with an acc. of the thing covered, is also construed with עַל, as

21[28] וְרִמָּה תְּכַסֶּה עליהם, Nu. 16[33] וַתְּכַס עליהם הארץ (*Lex.* 492*a*); hence אוֹר here is syntactically an acc. defining that *with which* the hands are covered (G–K. 117*z*, cf. *ee. ff*); so Mal. 2[16] וְכִסָּה חָמָס עַל־לְבוּשׁוֹ.

ויצו עליה במפגיע] צִוָּה עַל, as Gn. 2[16] 28[6] al. For עליה rd., with some MSS[Ken.], Houb. Sgf. Bu. Be. עליו: אור is masc., except Jer. 13[16], where, however (Bu.), שָׂמָהּ (with the old form of the sf. of 3 sg. masc., of which some 55 cases are preserved in the OT., G–K. 91*e*), could easily be pointed, as in Is. 30[33] מְדֻרָתֹה for מְדֻרָתָהּ (*v.* Dr. *Sam.* p. xxxiii). The meaning of מפגיע is uncertain. פגע is to *light upon*, *meet*, whether with an acc. or ב, in a friendly sense (1 S. 10[5], Gn. 32[2]), but with ב usually in a hostile sense, to *fall upon*, 1 S. 22[17. 18], though also to *meet* with a request = to *entreat*, c. 21[15] ומה־נועיל כי נפגע בו, Jer. 7[16]; in Hif. to *make to light or fall upon* (sq. ב), Is. 53[6] הפגיע בו את־עון כֻּלָּנוּ, to *make entreaty* (sq. ב), Jer. 36[25]; abs. to *make entreaty* or *interpose*, Is. 53[12] ולפשעים יפגיע, 59[16] כי אין מַפְגִּיעַ. We thus get here, (1) and commandeth it (viz. the light in his hands, to be used as lightning) *against the assailant* (Ew. Hrz. Reuss, Di. RVm.); but (see above) הפגיע does not mean to *assail*, nor מפגיע an assailant; (2) commandeth it, *as* (the ב *essentiæ*; Is. 40[10] etc.) *one making it fall upon* or *hit* (*sc.* what it is sent against, Is. 53[6]); so Del. (*als ein Treffenmachender*, "as a sure aimer"): of this rendering, also, RV. "And giveth it a charge *that it strike the mark*," is no doubt a paraphrase; (3) Ol. Bi.[1] Hfm. Bu. Be. Du. בְּמִפְגָּע, *against the mark* (7[20]); this is best. Du., thinking מפגע presupposes *slinging*, emends, very cleverly, but needlessly, and, in יפלם, questionably: עַל־כַּף יְפַלֵּם האור וַיְקַלְּעֵהוּ במפגע (better, Bu., ויקלעהו), Upon the sling (כף, as 1 S. 25[29] בְּתוֹךְ כַּף הַקָּלַע), he balanceth the light, And slingeth it against the mark. [Other suggestions, not probable, are: (1) to give כפים the meaning of *arch* (of heaven): cp. NH. כיפה in Levy, *NHWB*: Honth.; (2) to treat כפים as a measure (cp. 1 K. 18[44]): a couple of hand-breadths (of sky) he covers with light(ning): Ehrl.; (3) יצא—בערפל יכסה אור ויצא להב מפגע after 𝔖: Richter.]

33. יגיד עליו רֵעוֹ מִקְנֶה אַף עַל עוֹלֶה] Again a very difficult verse. [𝔊 (see on v.[28]) ὥραν ἔθετο κτήνεσιν, οἴδασιν

δὲ *κοίτης τάξιν*, in which עליו רעו מקנה was read in a different order as על (?) מקנה וידעו, and the rest of the v. still more differently from 𝔐.] רֵעַ—from the √ of הֵרִיעַ, to *shout, raise a war-cry*, or sound a blast on a horn or metal trumpet, rarely to cry out in pain (Is. 15^4, Mic. 4^9)—is elsewhere *shouting* (Ex. 32^{17}), such as might be mistaken for a קול מלחמה, or Mic. 4^9 † (לָמָּה תָרִיעִי רֵעַ) a *loud cry of* pain: *noise* (EVV.) is thus inadequate, nor is the word a very natural one to use of thunder, though Di. renders *Lärmruf*, and Bu. (transl.), Du. *Kriegsruf*, "war-cry" (cf. תרועה), supposing the figure to be that of the approaching armed war-god. But there is nothing in the context to suggest this; hence Bu.'s suggestion (in his note) to read רַעְמוֹ, *his thunder* (so Be.[K] "perhaps"), is very plausible. V.[b] in 𝔐 can only mean, "The cattle (tell) also concerning him that cometh up" (so Ew. Del.)—the cattle, by their presentiments of a storm coming up, announce that Yahweh is approaching in the thunder-cloud. The cattle, however, seem rather out of place here; and אף מקנה would be expected rather than מקנה אף. 𝔊 (Θ) *περὶ ἀδικίας*, 'ΑΣ read עַוְלָה, *unrighteousness*, for עוֹלֶה; so Böttcher, Hi. Di. Bu. Du. Reuss, with מְקַנֶּה (Hif. ptcp. Hi. Di.; cf. Ezk. 8^3 *end*), or מְקַנֵּא, or מְקַנֵּא (Bö. Du. Bu. Di. alt.), and understanding אף in the sense of *anger* (𝔗[1] and 𝔗[3] for מקנה אף have קנאתא ורוגזא, and 𝔗[2] מקנין ברוגזא,—both connecting מקנה with √ קנא): as one that (the ptc. מקנה an acc. referring to the sf. in עליו) is jealous with anger (or, with מְקַנֶּה, *makes anger jealous*, rouses it to jealousy) against unrighteousness. The construction of the vb. as in Zec. 8^2 וְחֵמָה גדולה קִנֵּאתִי לָהּ. קנאה is "jealousy," not "zeal" (Ps. 69^{10}, Is. 9^6 al. in EVV.): "zeal" is ardour for a cause, but it lacks the feeling of *exclusiveness*, which is essential to קנאה and "jealousy." Yahweh's "jealousy" is *exclusive*: it cannot tolerate another receiving what is His or His people's due; hence it is aroused especially by the desertion of Him for another god (Dt. 32^{21}: cf., noticing the preceding context, Dt. $29^{19(20)}$, Ezk. 5^{13} (note [11]) $16^{38.42}$ 23^{25}, Zeph. 1^{18}), or by the imperative need of interposing on His people's behalf against their foes (as Is. 9^6 59^{17}, Zec. 8^2: cf. Ezk. $36^{5.6}$ 38^{19}, Zeph. 3^8). It does not seem to be used elsewhere (unless in

Ps. 79[5]) of the feeling aroused by the dishonour done to God by *mere* wickedness; though that would not, perhaps, be more than an extension of its use in Ezk. 5[13] etc. Grā. Perles, for על עולה, עַלְעוֹלָה, *a storm, whirlwind* (cf. Aram. עַלְעוֹל, in 𝕿 for סערה, Jb. 38[1], Is. 29[6] al.; cf. the vb. עַלְעֵל, Jb. 27[21] 𝕿; Syr. ܥܰܠܥܳܠܐ (rare), PS. 2876; NH. עלעול, Sir. 43[17] marg., with the vb. עלעל, *Kil.* 7[7], Levy, *ChWB* ii. 221[a]); but this does not agree with מקנה: "the ?, yea the whirlwind" (*sc.* telleth concerning him). Be. קֹרֵא with עַלְעוֹלָה "yea, his whirlwind proclaimeth also." [If רעמו is rightly restored in [a], עלעלה, if = *his whirlwind*, would form a good parallel term; then מקנה אף should contain the parallel to יגיד עליו; but Be.'s קרא is not quite satisfactory (rather ? מְחַוֶּה, or better יְחַוֶּה), and אפו rather than אף is wanted. But *the* thunder, *the* storm would be more natural than *his*; and instead of עליו, a term for wrath ‖ to אף would be better (? זעמו): יגיד זעמו רַעַם יְחַוֶּה אפו עַלְעָלָה would be a good distich, but departs too much from 𝔐 to be at all certain. But in any case the ו of רעו may well have belonged to the second line.]

CHAPTER XXXVII.

1. אַף] אף, *yea*, introduces emphatically a new thought, Ps. $16^{6.7.9}$ (*Lex.* 64*b*); Grä. אַךְ; but this is less forcible (*Lex.* 36*b*). Bi. Du. הֲלֹא, supposing אף [not rendered by 𝔊 in 36^{28}] to have come in by error from 36^{33b}. But no change is necessary.

לִבִּי] [𝔊 (36^{28})] Bi.[2] Du. לִבְּךָ (addressed to Job); for (Du.) "it must be a matter of indifference to his hearers whether Elihu fears the storm or not, if they do not fear it." But is this reasoning conclusive? [For לבי ויתר we should perhaps read קרבי ולבי יתר, restoring the 3 : 3 rhythm; or, adopting Du.'s הלא for אף, קרבך ויתר לבך, which is rhythmically less easy, but קרבך = 𝔊 *σου ἡ διάνοια*, לבך = *σου ἡ καρδία*.]

וְיִתַּר] *and leaps* or *starts* (see Lv. 11^{21}, Hab. 3^{6} (not *drove asunder*, EVV.)). EVV. *is moved* is weak and colourless.

2. שִׁמְעוּ שָׁמוֹעַ] as 13^{17} 21^{2} [But here, perhaps, שמעו and שמוע (𝔐[1] שמע, *i.e.* שְׁמַע) are variants, both of which gained entrance to the text, producing the unusual rhythm 4 : 3 (see on 17^{14})]. 𝔊 (Θ) 𝔖 $^{U.A.}$ Du. שְׁמַע for שמעו (only necessary if הלא and לבך are read in [1]).

רֹגֶז] may here be rendered *rumbling* (see on 3^{17}). Bu. remarks on the effective word-painting produced here by the repeated ō sounds: שמעו שָׁמוֹעַ בְּרֹגֶז קֹלוֹ.

3. יִשְׁרֵהוּ] from שָׁרָה (Jer. 15^{11} Qrê †; but the Kt. is probably better): an Aram. word, שְׁרָא, to *loose*, Dn. 5^{16}, for *ἀπολύω*, Mt. 14^{23} 𝔖, פִּתַּח, Is. 20^{2} 𝔖, 45^{1} 𝔗, פִּתֵּחַ and שַׁלַּח, Is. 58^{6} 𝔖, הַתֵּר, Is. 58^{6} 𝔗, Ps. 79^{11} 𝔗. Here it = Heb. יְשַׁלְּחֵהוּ (cf. 38^{35} התשלח ברקים וילכו).

עַל] = אל, as frequently (*Lex.* 41*a*).

4. קוֹל] 2 MSS Bi. Bu. Be. Du. קוֹלוֹ.

יַרְעֵם] so always with this word, though the juss. *sense* is not intended (1 S. 2^{10}, 2 S. 22^{14} (= Ps. 18^{14} וַיַּרְעֵם), Jb. 37^{5} 40^{9}).

Either the *ĕ* was peculiar to this word, or rd. יִרְעַם. (The *Hif.* הִרְעִים, Ps. 29[3].)

וְלֹא יְעַקְּבֵם] *and stayeth them not.* עִקֵּב, if correct, will be a denom. from עָקֵב, prop. to *place* or *leave at the heel* = *leave behind* (in Arab. *ʿaḳaba* is to *follow at the heel*; and the Heb. עָקַב in Qal is to *attack at the heel*, or *overreach*), the Rabbis explaining it with more particular reference to עֵקֶב in the sense of *end*, Ps. 119[33. 112] (*Lex.* 784*b*): so, for instance, I.E. (Ps. 119[112]) וכן אמר על ,ועניו לא יְאַחֵר מן לְעוֹלָם עֵקֶב, Qi. לֹא יְאַחֲרֵם לְסוֹף, adding לְפִי שֶׁהַשָּׂכָר סוף המעשה (Ps. 19[12]) הַשָּׂכָר עֵקֶב. There is, however, an Aram. and NH. word עַכֵּב meaning—though its etymological relations are not apparent, unless by an anomalous change of consonants, it comes from עָקַב—to *hold back*, *delay* (Lv. 19[13] 𝔗[J] to *keep back* wages, Ithp. to *hold oneself back*, *delay*, Gn. 19[16] 𝔓 for ויתמהמה, 1 S. 20[38] 𝔗 for אַל־תַּעֲמֹד, al.; *NHWB* iii. 644*b*); and it is quite possible that יְעַכְּבֵם should be read here. 𝔗 here has יְעַכְּבִינַן; and 3 MSS read יעכבם. The sf., however, has no antecedent, and 4[c] is (Bu.) "long for one line, and short for two": hence Bu. St., very plausibly, וְלֹא יְעַקֵּב בְּרָקִים, "and he delayeth not the lightnings." Du.: אחריו ישאג קוֹלוֹ יַרְעֵם אֵל לֹא יְעַקֵּב מִפִּיו יִשָּׁמַע קוֹלוֹ (for נאונו in [4]) גְּרוֹנוֹ: (from [5a]) בקולו; but the threefold קוֹלוֹ, each time at the end of the line, is not an elegance, nor is so much change necessary. [But Du.'s last line is better than 𝔐, which is both short and feeble.]

5. [The rhythm is 4 : 4—rare in Job (7[4] n., 21[28] n.), and sometimes at least due to textual corruption.] There is force in Bu.'s remark that [a] and [b] form a poor parallel; in [a] also the adv. acc. נפלאות halts after ירעם אל בקולו, which in its turn seems a variant of [4b]; nor is a fall of snow [5] a cause (כִּי) of thunder: hence, comparing 5[9] עשה גדולות ואין חקר נפלאות עד אין מספר (cf. 9[10] and 36[26]), he would read עשה נפלאות ואין (ולא) חקר גדולות ולא נדע. Du. for [a] reads יַרְאֵנוּ אֵל נפלאות.

6. הֱוֵא] imper. from הֲוָא, the Aram. form of the Heb. הָיָה, found six times in the OT., here, Gn. 27[29] הֱוֵה, Is. 16[4] (in the prophecy on Moab) הֱוִי, Neh. 6[6] and Qoh. 2[22] הֹוֶה, Qoh. 11[3] יְהוּא † (cf. also יֶהֱוֶה). If correct, the vb. will be used in its primitive sense of *Fall*, found in Arab. (Qor. 53[1] "By the star اذا هوى when it

sets"), but only here in either Heb. or Aram. Grä. Sgf. Perl. Bu. (not Du.) רַוֵּה or רַוֵּא, *saturate* (Ps. 65[11] etc.), which might seem better suited to rain than to snow; it is, however, attributed to at least הגשם והשלג together in Is. 55[10].

וגשם מטר וגשם מטרות עזו] ל must be understood from [a] before גשם (each time). גשם מטרות after גשם מטר forms a hardly tolerable combination. Probably וגשם מטר should be omitted with 3 MSS, Ol. Wr. Bi.[1] Hfm. Bu. Ley. 𝔖 omits וגשם מטרות. Sgf. (omitting [c]) has for [b] וגשם המטיר; Hfm. (omitting [b]) for [c] has וגשם וּמְטָרוֹת עֹזּוּ (imper. *Be strong*, ל, as before, being understood from [a] before 'נ and 'מ: cf. Pr. 8[28] בַּעֲזוֹז עֵינוֹת תְּהוֹם); Du. (for [b] and [c]), retaining the ת in מטרות, נשם וממר תְּעֹזּוּ; Be.[K], as Hfm. or Bu., or וגשם וממר עֲרֹפוּ (*Drop*: Dt. 32[2]).

7. ביד] חתם ב' is peculiar, but it is found in 33[16] (also Elihu). Hi. Grä. Du. Be. בְּעַד (9[7]): but ביד is more expressive.

כל אנשי מעשהו] RV. "that all men whom he hath made may know (it)" is grammatically correct, but does not yield a good sense: read with 𝔙 either לדעת כל־אֲנָשִׁים מעשהו (Ol. Kamp. De. (note), Di.) or כל־אֱנוֹשׁ מעשהו (Bi.[1] Hfm. Du. Be.): Bu. either, at the same time suggesting אֱנוֹשׁ עֹשֵׂהוּ. כל may be repeated by error from [a] (Bu. Du. Be.[K]). [𝔊 curiously for מעשהו has τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ἀσθένειαν whence Ehrlich questionably, מעטהו, that every man may know his *nothingness*.]

8. וַתָּבוֹא] Bu. וְתבוא.

9. מן החדר] RV. "out of the chamber (of the south)," so De., "the chamber" being an abbreviation for "the chamber of the south"; cf. 9[9]; but this is not probable. Du. (Ch. מֵחַדְרֵי) מִן חֶדֶר תֵּימָן סוּפָה (cf. Is. 21[1] כַּסּוּפוֹת בַּנֶּגֶב לַחֲלוֹף); [but the elimination of the vb. is awkward. Be.[K] מן חדר תימן תבוא סופה; but this produces the rhythm 2 : 2 : 2 (17[1] n.), In 𝔐 the rhythm is 3 : 2, 17[13] n.); but perhaps the very doubtful מִמְּזָרִים in [b] represents two words in the original text.]

מִמְּזָרִים] if correct, *the scatterers*, i.e., *the scattering* winds (RVm.), poet. de *ventis borealibus*, quippe qui nubibus dispersis frigus offerant serenum (Ges. *Thes.*; so Di.); cf. Qor. 51[1] وَالذَّارِيَاتِ ذَرْوًا, *By the scattering* (winds)! But in this case

(Du.) the fem. ptcp. would have been expected. Voigt. Bu. Oo. Honth. St., plausibly, מִמְּזָוִים, *out of the storehouses* (Ps. 144[13] †). [𝔊 ἀπὸ δὲ ἀκρωτηρίων (? an error for ἀρκτῴων), 𝔖 ܡܢ ܓܪܒܝܐ (= מזרמים, or rather, since the pl. does not occur, מִזְרָם, whence N. Herz. in *JThS* xiv. 577,—From scorching heat (מְחֵרֶר) comes the *samûm*, And from sweeping rains coolness; but סופה = *samûm* is doubtful), 𝔗 מכות מזרים, 𝔙 ab Arcturo, 'Α καὶ ἀπὸ Μαζουρ.]

10. יִתֵּן] so Gn. 38[28], Pr. 13[10] 10[24]: though not, as Ew. 295*d*, Del. G–K.[26] 144*b* (omitted in G–K.[28]), al. (v. *Lex.* 680*a*), an impersonal usage = Germ. "es giebt": but *sc.* הַנֹּתֵן, "the giver giveth" = ". . . is given" (G–K. 144*d*, *e*, Kö. 324*d*, β). Σ 𝔖𝔗 render by a passive (so Hi. Di. alt. Bu. Du. יֻתַּן); but the passive rendering is not proof that the translators *vocalised* יֻתַּן. [Ehrlich יִתֵּךְ: in [b] מוצק from יצק, not צוק.]

ורחב מים במוצק] and the breadth of waters is in narrowness (36[16]) = the broad waters are narrowed, viz. by ice forming along the edges, and gradually contracting the water.

11. בְּרִי] רִי *saturation*, for רְוִי, from רָוָה (10 n.), like אִי, כִּי (Is. 3[24]), עִי, from אָוָה, כָּוָה, עָוָה (G–K. 24*b*, *end*; cf. 84*a* [c. e] 93*y*). [This explanation of 𝔐 is preferable to *corn* (Σ 𝔙; cp. בַּר), or *a chosen one* (Θ 'Α), or *purity*, *brightness* (𝔗), or (= רְאִי) *the rainbow* (Hoffm.). 𝔖 for ברי יטריח has ܢܣܒܠ ܡܛܠܛܠܐ: 𝔐 is probably corrupt and ברק or ברד should be restored; see next n.]

יטריח †] טָרַח is to *toil* or *labour* (cf. in 𝔗 טְרַח, as Dt. 6[11] 𝔍 ובטורחתי די ,וּיתים אשר לא נטעת = ויתח דלא טרחת למינצב Qoh. 2[11] ובעמל שעמלתי לעשות = טרחית למעבד, 9[9]; cf. Nu. 11[11] 𝔍 טַרְחָא דעמא הדין = משא העם הזה: see, further, *ChWB* i. 319, and *NHWB*, *s.v.*: so Heb. טֹרַח = *troublesome burden*, "cumbrance," Dt. 1[12] איכה אשא טרחכם, Is. 1[14] היו עלי לְטֹרַח †). הטריח is therefore properly to *make to toil* or *labour*, which might also mean to *burden* (belasten); but in the NH. usage (*ll.cc.*) it has the derived sense of to *trouble*, *importune* (belästigen), e.g. *Sanh.* 8*a* מטריחך אותי להחזיר, thy *importune* one to repay; *Ta'an.* 24*a* הטרחת את־קוֹנְךָ להוציא וג': still, when the Elihu speeches were written, it might have had the more primary sense of to *burden*. But the idea of the rain with which the clouds are laden is not here very

suitable: we have [9b] cold, [10] ice, and [11b] lightning. Hence Du. בָּרָד, *hail*, for ברי, [the vb. then taking two accusatives: cp. G–K. 117*cc*]; Be.[T] Honth. Bu. אַף בָּרָק יִטְרַח עָב, yea, the cloud *casteth forth lightning* (טָרַח, from Arab. *ṭaraḥa*, to *cast* or *throw*: Lane, 1837). This agrees excellently with [b]; but the explanation of טרח is precarious.

יפיץ עֲנַן אורו] RV. "He *spreadeth abroad* the cloud of his lightning": but הפיץ is to *scatter* (so, rightly, AV. *he scattereth*), not to *spread abroad* (פרס): hence point, with 𝔊 (Θ), *διασκορπιεῖ νέφος φῶς αὐτοῦ*, 𝔙 et nubes spargunt lumen suum, 15 MSS, *Hagiogr. Neapol.* 1487, 𝔗 of Rabb. edd., Venice, 1517, 1525, 1568, and of the Antwerp Polyglott (see De Rossi, *Supplementa ad Varias Lectiones*, 1798, p. 125), עָנָן (so Le Clerc, Mich. Dathe, Bu. Du. Be.), *the cloud scattereth its light* (*lightning*).

12. מְסִבּוֹת] adv. accus. (in prose סָבִיב): from מֵסַב, a *surrounding place*: 2 K. 23[5] מְסִבֵּי ירושלים, the *places round about*, (but ? rd. בסביבי, as Jer. 32[44] 33[13]); 1 K. 6[29] מֵסַב, adv. acc. *round about* (but rd. probably מִסָּבִב); Ca. 1[12] מְסִבּוֹ, *his table* or *divan*; Ps. 140[10] ראש מְסִבָּי (? מְסֹבְבַי). Bu. מִסָּבִיב; but מסביב is not used of a person or thing moving *round about*, but of people moving about, or of things happening, *round about* a person. The v. is unevenly divided: hence Bu. inserts יתהלך (Be. יְסוֹבֵב) *before* מתהפך, Ley, Du. Honth. insert יתהלך *after* it. The former is better: and it (the lightning) turneth itself round about, turning itself by his guidance.

תחבולֹת] *steersmanship*, used metaphorically of *direction*, *guidance*, *counsel*; only in the Wisdom lit.: Pr. 1[5] 11[14] באין תחבֻלות יפל־עם ותשועה ברב יועץ, 12[5] 20[18] מחשבות בְּעֵצָה תכון ובתחבֻלות עֲשֵׂה מלחמה, 24[6] (nearly = 20[18b] + 11[14b]) †.

לפעלם] in 𝔐 this is the middle of the verse; but really a new verse should begin here. The sf. will refer to the flashes of lightning in the poets' mind: but Grä. Be.[K] Bu. לִפְעֹל מִכֹּל־אשר יְצַוֵּהוּ, *to do* (anything) *of all that* (= *whatever*) *he commandeth it*. But מכל is rather a refinement: would not the poet be content with כל אשר?

ארצה] si vera l., a poet. form for ארץ, as ארצה, 34[13] (see *n.*):

but no doubt אַרְצֹה (= אַרְצוֹ) should be read with 𝔖, as there (Mich., Reiske, Bu. Be.); cf. Pr. 8[31] מְשַׂחֶקֶת בְּתֵבֵל אַרְצוֹ. Du. כִּרְצוֹנוֹ, *according to his pleasure.*

13. אם לארצו] om. אם, as repeated by error, with Bi.[1] Di. Sgf. Bu. Be.; Du. וְלִמְאֵרָה (Dt. 28[20], Pr. 3[33] al.), comparing En. 59[1]. [For types of parallelism somewhat similar to the text as emended by Du., cp. 31[13] 36[9], and see n. on 11[10].]

ימציאהו] 34[11] (see n.).

14. עֲמֹד] Du. Be.[K] to [a], *m. c.*: [but this merely produces 4 : 3 (17[14]) instead of 3 : 4: the rhythm would become normal by the omission of עמד].

15. התדע בשום אלוה עליהם] RV. Di. "Dost thou know *about* (as 35[15]) God's laying (His charge) upon them?" (the pron. referring to the natural agencies just described; cf. בָּם, 36[31]); שׂוּם עַל, as Ex. 5[8], though there an *object* follows, which is here desiderated. 𝔊 οἴδαμεν ὅτι ὁ θεὸς ἔθετο ἔργα αὐτοῦ, whence Bi.[2] Du. פְּעָלָיו (Du. אֵל) בשום אלוה, ". . . about God's *ordaining, appointing* (*Lex.* 963) *his works.*" This is the best that can be done with the passage.

והופיע] the pf. with *waw* consec. in a freq. sense, carrying on בשום, as 1 K. 8[33], Ezk. 3[20] (Dr. 118; G–K. 114*r*).

16. התדע על מפלשי עב] ידע על is as strange as 36[21] בחר על. Perhaps the ע in על is a dittograph: ל will then be the *nota accus.* after תדע (as, *e.g.*, 5[2]). Be.[K] הֲתִדְאֶה wilt thou *soar* above . . . ? but דאה means rather to *dart* or *swoop* (Dt. 28[49], Ps. 18[11], Jer. 48[40] = 49[22] †).

מפלשי] *balancings*, from פִּלֵּס, to *weigh* (fig. to *make even* a road); cf. פֶּלֶס, a *balance*, Pr. 16[11], Is. 40[12] †. Bu. (note, but not in translation) מפרשי, as 36[29]: but the idea of the clouds laden with moisture being poised in the sky is more picturesque.

מפלאות †] Probably miswritten for נפלאות, as [14] (a few MSS, Sgf. Bi.[2] Bu. Be.[T]), through the influence of מפלשי.

תְּמִים דֵּעִים] cf. 36[4] תְּמִים דֵּעוֹת (of Elihu): דֵּעִים [MS[Ken. 153] רעים: 𝔊 πονηρῶν] only here: cf. on 32[6]. Du. [precariously, though 𝔐 is not too certain] for [b] מַפִּיל תְּהוֹם מֵרַעַם, *making a water-flood* (cf. תְּהוֹם in Ps. 42[8]) *to fall* (*pour*) *down at the thunder,*

"the cloud that floats so lightly in the air, may nevertheless in a thunder-storm discharge a deluge of water on the earth."

17. אשר בגדיך] a pron. of the 2nd person being the supplement of אשר: "*Thou whose* garments are warm"; cf. Hos. 14[4] אשר בך יְרֻחַם יתום, *Thou through whom* the fatherless is compassionated! Ps. 71[19. 20] (*Lex.* 82*a*). [Du. Peake take אשר as a conjunction: what time thy garments are warm. RV. (How thy garments are warm?) makes [17] still dependent on התדע in 17[16].]

בְּהַשְׁקִט] השקיט = to *show quietness* (the "internal" Hif.: G–K. 53*e*); so Is. 7[4] הִשָּׁמֵר וְהַשְׁקֵט, 57[20] (= Jer. 49[23]) כי הַשְׁקֵט לא יוכל.

דָּרוֹם] poet. and late: elsewhere only Dt. 33[23], Ezk. (13 times), Qoh. 1[6] 11[3]. Also only here of the south *wind*.

18. תרקיע] with the interrog. not expressed (G–K. 150*a*, *b*). רָקַע (Hif. only here) is to *stamp* with the feet, Ezk. 6[11] 25[6]; to *beat down* (cf. in Syr. ܪܩܝܥܐ = πεπιεσμένον, Lk. 6[38]), or *beat out*, especially of metals to *beat out* into plates, as Jer. 10[9] כסף מְרֻקָּע, Is. 40[19], Ex. 39[3], Nu. 17[4] (of the censers) וַיְרַקְּעוּם צִפּוּי לַמִּזְבֵּחַ (cf.[3] ועשו אותם רִקֻּעֵי פַחִים צִפּוּי למזבח). The word is evidently chosen here, with allusion to the רָקִיעַ.

עִמּוֹ] *with him*; *i.e.* either *with him*, as his companion and equal, or *like him* (9[26]).

לשחקים] the ל, as *Lex. s.v.* ל, 3a.

שחקים] properly *clouds*; here poet. for the רָקִיעַ.

רְאִי †] *mirror*; = מַרְאָה, Ex. 38[8] †.

מוּצָק] Hof. ptcp. from יָצַק; cf. הַיָּם מוּצָק, 1 K. 7[23]. Different from the מוּצָק of [10], and the מוּצָק of 36[16] (from צוק).

19. הודיענו] *c.* 25 MSS, Orient. Kt., 𝔊𝔖 Di. Bi. Du. Be. הודיעֵנִי, "Make *me* to know what we (men) shall say to him."

לו] [*to* him (God), as commonly understood; *of*, *about* (as Gn. 20[13]: *Lex.* 514*a*, e) it (Ehrlich: see on היספר, v.[20]].

לא נערך] *sc.* מִלִּין (see 32[14]); cf. Ps. 5[4] (in c. 33[5] מלחמה is more probably to be understood).

20. היספר] [Ehrlich postulates for this word here a sense found in Arabic, as, *e.g.*, in سفرت الريح الغيم, the wind *dispersed* the clouds (cited by Lane); and deletes לו as an insertion

made when, this unusual sense not being understood, יספר was taken in its familiar sense. Omitting v.^{18} he obtains for $^{19a.\,20}$ the meaning: Teach me then what we shall say of it (*i.e.* the marvels of $^{16f.}$) . . . Will they (the clouds) be dispersed if I speak, Or did man ever command that they should be driven away (יבלע). But these suggestions are in themselves hazardous, and associated with others equally hazardous in the remainder of $^{15-24}$, and form no safe way of escape from the strange and perhaps corrupt expressions in 𝔐].

אם אמר איש כי יְבֻלָּע] "Or did man ever say (= wish, purpose: Ex. 2^{14}; *Lex. s.v.* אמר, 2) that he would be swallowed up (fig. for annihilated)?" אמר כי, as 36^{10}, where see *n.* Du. הֲיִסּוֹר לוֹ כִּי יְדַבֵּר אם אמר וג׳, "Hath he (God) a reprover (see 40^{2}), when He speaks, Or doth a man say that He is confused?" understanding בלע in the doubtful sense of בָּלַל (see [also, perhaps, Is. 3^{12} (n.) 19^{3} 28^{7}, Ps. 107^{27}]).

21. ראו] Bu. רָאוּ.

בהיר †] is of ambiguous meaning: the √ occurs otherwise in OT. only in בַּהֶרֶת, a *bright spot* on the skin, Lev. 13–14 †. [But elsewhere two opposite meanings occur: *bright*, and *dark*, *dull*, *obscure*.] (*a*) in Arab. *bahara* is properly (Lane, 265) to *overcome* (iii. to contend with, and overcome, another for glory, superiority, or excellence; viii. to *arrogate* a thing *to oneself* falsely), then to *surpass*, *excel*, in beauty, knowledge, goodness, etc. (abs. the moon *surpasses* the stars (*sc.* in brightness), and *the surpasser* is a term for the moon, as outshining the stars (*ib.* 266*a*)), and, lastly, to *shine*, as "the cloud *shone brightly*"; (*b*) Eth. [with metathesis] ብርሀ: (common) is to *be bright* or *shine* (Di. *Lex.* 499*f*); (*c*) in Syriac, the √ itself is not quoted, but ܒܗܘܪ is *fuscus*, *maculosus*, of colours, lux *subobscura*, and then of an *obscure* rumour, or hint, ܒܗܘܪܐܝܬ is *obscurely*, = ἀμυδρῶς, of light, ܒܗܝܐ, *obscure*, *uncertain* (of knowledge), *Ephr.* i. 462; ܒܗܪܘܪܐ is *twilight* (the knowledge of men compared with that of angels is like the *twilight*); ܒܗܪܘܪܐ ܕܨܦܪܐ is the *twilight* before sunrise, but it also denotes *lux ortus*,

splendor, *Ephr.* iii. 15 (ܡܫܒܗܪܢ, and derivatives, in the sense of *to glory*, *boast* = καυχάομαι, are common); (*d*) in 𝕿 rare; only בַּהֲרָא, בַּהֲרְתָא = בַּהֶרֶת, and בָּהִיר, 𝕿² here [where בהיר means *clear*, *bright*] והשתא לא אסתכלו באורייתא אתעבידו שמיא בהירי מן לאחתא טלא ומטרא ורוח עברת ודכאינן, [though in the related passage in NH. in] Ta'an. 7^b (Levy, *ChWB*, and *NHWB*) [בהיר is used of the *dark* rain-clouds]: אפילו בשעה שעננים עומדין בהירין להוריד טל וממר רוח עברה ותטהרם (edd. שהרקיע נעשה בהורין בהורין). [In the present passage, if ^{21b} is in place the meaning *obscure* is rather indicated by the parallel לא ראו.] Wr. Sgf. Be.[T] proposed בהאירו for בהיר הוא, [producing the abnormal rhythm 3 : 2 for the normal 3 : 3 of 𝕸].

22. זהב] cannot be right, in spite of Del.'s attempt to explain it (in its literal sense) on the ground that the N., according to the ancients [Del. cites Herod. iii. 116; Pliny, *HN* 6^{11} 33^7], was specially the region of gold; and that the meaning is: men can bring gold out of the darkness of the mysterious North, but upon God is terrible majesty (the argument being like that of $28^{1.6}$): but there is here no real antithesis between the two ideas contrasted. AV. renders 𝕸 correctly *gold*: the Revisers, seeing this was out of the question, but not feeling at liberty to emend the text, give the impossible paraphrase *golden splendour* (cf. 𝕲 in Æschylean language, worthy of a better cause, νέφη χρυσαυγοῦντα; cf. Soph. *O.C.* χρυσαυγὴς κρόκος): change a letter (זֹהַר for זהב, Grä. Che. Du. Be. Honth. St. Bu.²: see Ezk. 8^2 and Dn. 12^3 יַזְהִירוּ כְּזֹהַר הרקיע †), and we get the sense which the Revisers vainly struggled to obtain.

ויאתה] 3^{25} 16^{22} 30^{14}.

על אלוה נורא הוד] "upon God majesty is terrible." We should expect הוד נורא ". . . is terrible majesty," and so Bu. would read; but נורא הוד is more rhythmical, and in Heb. the effect of the unusual order has not the stiffness which it has in English. Di. compares Gn. 29^2 והאבן גדולה על־פי הבאר.

23. שדי לא מצאנֻהו] the *casus pendens*; Dr. § 197.

שגיא] see on 36^{26}.

שגיא כח] these words halt after שדי לא מצאנהו, and ^{b} is unrhythmical. Bu. plausibly, שדי לא מצאנֻהו שגיא כח ורב צדקה

מ֗שפט צַדִּיק לא יענה. Du. שניא כח ורב צדקה ומשפט לא יענה; [but the rhythm (4 : 3 (2)) in both Bu. and Du. is suspicious. Possibly we should retain 𝕳 (except יענה), merely changing the pointing of 𝕸: שניא כח ומשפט ורב צדקה לא־יְעַוֵּת (rhythm 3 : 3); the coupling of כח and משפט is a little strange, but by no means so strange as משפט ורב צ׳ in 𝕸. In the context it is not difficult to understand משפט after יעות (see next n.) or יְעַנֶּה, if this be retained].

יְעַנֶּה] 𝕿 יְסַגֵּף (elsewhere also for עִנָּה, as Gn. 16[6] 𝕿[J], Is. 58[3. 5] 𝕿; Syr. ܣܓܦ (common) is *læsit, nocuit, ἔβλαψεν*), *'A κακουχήσει*; RVm. "To judgement and plenteous justice he *doeth no violence*." עִנָּה דין occurs in the Talm., though (to judge from Levy) in a peculiar sense, to "afflict," *i.e.* vexatiously interfere with, or wrong, the right of a condemned criminal by deferring his execution beyond the day originally fixed for it: אין מְעַנִּין את דינו של זה אֶלָּא מְמִיתִין אותו מִיָּד. Whether the expression was in use when the Elihu speeches were written is more than we can say: if not, יְעַוֵּת (as 8[3] 34[12]) would be an easy emendation. Bi. Hfm. Be. יַעֲנֶה, *answereth not* (those who presumptuously question the justice of His rule); but the thought is inadequately expressed, besides being alien to the context.

24. יְרֵאוּהוּ] *fear him*—as an established fact (the force of the pf.), though not necessarily universally (cf. 36[24b] אשר שֹׁרְרוּ אנשים). 𝕲 (φοβηθήσονται) 𝕾𝖁 express יִירָאוּהוּ, which is adopted by Bu. Du. St., though not in the freq. sense of the impf., but as = "*should* fear him." [With the similar sounding forms from the two different vbs. יראוה (from ירא), יראה (from ראה), cp. 6[21]. 𝕲 φοβηθήσονται in both lines; 𝖁 also treats כל חכמי לב as subj. of the vb. in [b]; and it would be easy to read יְרָאֻהוּ in [b]; but, though 𝕸 is awkward, the distich so obtained, Therefore men (in general) fear him, (But) the wise in heart do not fear him, is certainly not to be preferred. Ehrlich: But (لكن = לכן) this, viz., what has been mentioned in [23], (only) ordinary men see (יִרְאוּהָ), the wise in heart see it (יִרְאוּהָ) not.]

CHAPTER XXXVIII.

1. מן] [*out of*; Ehrlich, *after*, Hos. 6².

מנ | הסערה] so Kit., with 𝔅. According to Baer (p. 53) and Gi. the Kt. reads as one word מנ ו הסערה, the Qrê as two words מן ו הסערה. The same peculiarity recurs in 40⁶ Kt. מנ ו סערה, Qrê מן ו סערה. The Qrê is, of course, correct.

2. מי זה] The rendering "Who is *this* that . . . ?" is here admissible, and more forcible than any other (*Lex.* 261*a*, 4b; cf. Is. 63¹).

בלי דעת] a short circ. cl. qualifying a subst., as Ps. 63² ארץ בלי מים; more commonly qualifying a verb (8¹¹; see *n.*).

3. כְּגֶבֶר] כְּגִבֹּר, *like a mighty man* (*a warrior*), 𝔖 (ܓܢܒܪܐ), 𝔗 1 MS (כגיבור) Hfm. Bi. Bu. Be. Ben-N. כְּגֶּבֶר, as in Ezk. 17¹⁰ כְּגַעַת for Ben-Asher כְּגַעַת, to avoid the juxtaposition of two similar aspirates: cf. Baer, *Job*, p. 63, and *Ezek.* p. 114, who cites Ḳimchi, *Michlol*, 90*a*, and Baer and Strack, *Diḳduḳê ha-teʿamim*, p. 30. See also G–K. 21*d*. For כְּגבר (not כַּגֶּבר), see on 13²⁸.

ואשאלך] om. ו, with *c.* 60 MSS, 𝔖𝔙 Bi. Be. Bu. Du.; cf. 42⁵.

5. ממדיה †] from [מֵמַד]; cf. מֵסַב (37¹²). [But Ehrlich suggests that it is the sing. (cp. G–K. 93*ss*) of Piel part. of מדד = מדה, and renders, What (מי, as Jg. 13¹⁷, or read מה as in Pr. 30⁴) is the name (שֵׁם) of him that measured it?]

כי תדע] either *since thou knowest* (iron.), or (Del.) *if thou knowest* (cf. Pr. 30⁴ מה שמו ומה שם בנו כי תדע); the impf. is no bar to either of these renderings, for it is often used of present knowledge: 11⁸ 37¹⁵·¹⁶, Pr. 27¹ 30³, Is. 58³, Hos. 13⁴, 1 K. 3⁷, Ps. 51⁵ 73²² etc. Di. Dav. Bu. Du. *that thou shouldest know*

(viz. through being present at the time); but the explanation is rather forced.

6. ירדה] Gn. 31[51] המצבה אשר יריתי; cf. Dn. 7[9] עד די כרסון רְמִיו; [and for the expression *to cast, throw*, i.e. *to lay*, a foundation or a building, cp. in other languages *nadû uššê* (Del. *Assyr. HWB* p. 448 f.); ܫܬܐܣܬܐ, *foundation* (*e.g.* Mt. 13[35], 2 Macc. 2[29]); *fundamenta jacere*; *βάλλεσθαι ἄστυ*].

7. בְּרָךְ . . . וַיָּרִיעוּ] Dr. § 118; G–K. 114*r*. [𝔊 *ὅτε ἐγενήθησαν ἄστρα, ᾔνεσάν με φωνῇ μεγάλῃ πάντες ἄγγελοί μου*. Whether or not this is a "dogmatic correction" (Di.) to remove the inconsistency with Gn. 1[14ff.], it is self-condemned, like Me.'s בָּרָא for ברן, by its destruction alike of the parallelism and poetry of 𝔐.]

8. ויסך] 𝔙 Quis conclusit . . . ? whence Me. Wr. Bi. Bu. Du. Be. (ו)מִי סָךְ, who hedged about . . . ? which, as [8] does not refer to the direct sequel of [6], is preferable, as well as more forcible. [Ehrlich וְאָסֻךְ, carrying on ויריעו in v.[7]—a slighter change, but less probable.] סוּךְ, as 3[23] † (sq. בעד; but the variant שׂוּךְ, 1[10], sq. בעד, is combined, Hos. 2[8] †, with an accus.). [The corruption may, however, lie deeper: סוך, *hedge about*, is not quite the word to be expected with *doors* (ct. "thorns" in Hos. 2[8]); the line unduly anticipates [10b], and the repetition of דלתים, [8a. 10b], betrays a poverty of language not lightly to be attributed to this writer. If the last two letters of בדלתים be a dittograph, what remains closely resembles a good parallel to [b], and we should perhaps read בלדת or (unless this can be treated as בְּלֶדֶת) בְּהִלָּדֵת—*when the sea was born*. But it is less easy to recover the beginning of the line, which should contain a question (cp. [4. 12] etc.). Be[K] suggests, not very satisfactorily, סכר for ויסך.]

בגיחו מרחם יֵצֵא] when it burst out, *issuing forth* from the womb: the impf. qualifying בגיחו, just as 31[34] וָאֶדֹּם לֹא אֵצֵא פתח, and so capable of being rendered idiomatically by a ptcp. [גיח, 40[23] (of Jordan), Ezk. 32[2] and in the Hif. (of an ambush rushing forth) Jg. 20[33]. The occurrence of the word in Mic. 4[10], Ps. 22[10] † is doubtful. The bursting out (of waters) is no doubt the meaning of the n. pr. גיחון, and to burst out (with reference to waters) is

frequently expressed by ܦܪܥ and derivatives (PS. 676 f.), and جاخ يجوخ is used of water carrying away a bank, etc. Whether in Heb. the word was used by itself with reference to the bursting out of the fœtus from the womb depends on the punctuation and interpretation of the ambiguous forms in Ps. 22[10] (= גוי, Ps. 71[6]) and Mic. 4[10].]

10. ואשבר עליו חקי] *And I brake upon* (or *against*) *it my boundary*,—חֹק being (as explained on 26[10]) a *prescribed limit* in space, *i.e.* a *boundary*, as in 14[5. 13] it is a *prescribed limit* in time; and *brake* being an allusion to the rocks and cliffs in which the mainland often abruptly ends (cf. ῥηγμίν); so Ew. Del. Di. Bu. Du. 𝔊𝔖 express חֹק; Di. Bi. Du. Be. חֻקּוֹ (as Pr. 8[29] בשומו לים חֻקּוֹ,—where, however (see on 26[10]), חקו need not mean more than *decree*). 𝔊 ἐθέμην δὲ αὐτῇ ὅρια, 𝔖 ܣܡܬ ܠܗ ܬܚܘܡܐ, 𝔙 circumdedi illud terminis meis (חֻקַּי), 𝔗 ופסקית עלוי גזירתי. The fig. is a bold one; and one wishes that the evidence were clearer that חֹק really expressed the idea of a *boundary*. Me. Wr., after 𝔊 (which may, however, only paraphrase), וָאָשִׁית (cf. 14[13]: in this case, for עַל, cf. 13[26] כתב עַל, Gn. 30[28] נקב על); Be. ("fortasse") questionably וָאֶשְׁטֹר, *and I wrote* (*prescribed*), from Ass. and Arab. (*Lex.* 1009*a*). RV. *prescribed*, with marg. "Heb. *brake*": but the two renderings are inconsistent: "prescribed" is not a legitimate paraphrase of "brake": if "brake" with חק is deemed to be too bold a combination, the only alternative is to emend the Heb., and to read some word—such as ואשית—which may be fairly rendered "prescribed."

11. ואמר עד פה תבוא ולא תסיף] Du. Be.[K] om. תבוא, Bi. St. ולא תסיף,—each *m. c.* But without תבוא, ולא תסיף attaches very badly to עד פה; and the omission of ולא ססיף greatly weakens the force of the words spoken. It is monstrous to spoil a verse—and especially a fine verse—for the sake of supposed metrical requirements. [ואמר might be omitted, leaving the rhythm 4 : 4 (7[4] n.): then for the omission of an introductory ואמר, לאמר, etc., cp. 4[17ff.] 15[23a] 17[12] 22[20].]

ופא ישית בגאון גליך] Here there must be an error in

𝔐; for except by unsatisfactory artificial expedients no sense can be extracted from it. Ges. Hrz. Schl. Del. al. understood חֹק (cf. 14[18] תָּשִׁית לִי חֹק וְתִזְכְּרֵנִי), and take יָשִׁית impersonally (*sc.* הַשָּׁת), *Thes.* 1400*b* "*hic ponant*, i.e. *ponatur* (*sc.* terminus, v.[10] [חֹק]), *superbiæ fluctuum tuorum.*" But חק is too far off to be reasonably supplied by the reader in thought, and the impers. ישית is here exceedingly weak. Hi. takes פא as the obj.: "A 'here' doth one set against," etc.; Ew. § 294[a] ("perhaps"), and apparently Di.: "Here (= this place) will arrest the pride," etc. (*Einhalt thun* dem Übermuth . . .; to judge from the comparison of שית מן, 10[20] (but see *n.*), taken by Di. as elliptical for שית יד ב׳, lay (the hand) upon = arrest); but פה in either of these usages would be very un-Hebraic, and the sense *arrest* for שית ב׳ has no support elsewhere. Du. "And *leave off* (lass ab: שית, as 10[20] (but see *n.*)) *with* the swelling of thy waves." Qi. (Comm.) ופא ישית וְיִלָּחֵם בגאון גליך, apparently taking ישית in the military sense of Ps. 3[7], Is. 22[7]: "Here will the appointed boundary assail and resist thy waves." Seb. Münster (1534–5), Et hic ponet (impetus tuus) elationem fluctuum tuorum; Coverdale (1539), and here shalt thou laye doune (cf. Münster's *ponet*) thy proude and hye wawes; Geneva Vers. (1568), and heere shall it (*i.e.* God's decree and commandement, as v.[10]) staye thy proud waues; EVV., finely, "shall thy proud waves be stayed." 𝔊 *ἀλλ' ἐν σεαυτῇ συντριβήσεταί σου τὰ κύματα*, 𝔖 ܢܬܒܪܘܢ (? rd. with Me. ܬܬܒܪ, *thou shalt break*), 𝔙 Et hic *confringes* tumentes fluctus tuos, 𝔗 וכא תשוי בניותנות גלליך. Hence (after 𝔊𝔙) Ew. יִשָּׁבֵר ג׳נ׳, *shall be broken* (or יִשְׁתֹּק, Jon. 1[11. 12]); so (יִשָּׁבֵר) Wr. Bäthg.; Bi. Bu. Be. Honth. St. יִשְׁבֹּת ג׳נ׳, *shall cease* (ישבת for 𝔐[1] ישתב). Either of these yields an excellent sense: for ישבר, cf. Lv. 26[19] ושברתי את גאון עזכם; for יִשְׁבֹּת—or, more forcibly, יַשְׁבֵּת—Is. 13[11] וְהִשְׁבַּתִּי גאון זדים, Ezk. 7[24] וְהִשְׁבַּתִּי גאון עזכם (30[18] 33[28] with וְנִשְׁבַּת); and so, by legitimate means, we obtain the sense, not materially different from that which EVV. obtained by illegitimate means, And here shall the pride of thy waves be made to cease,—פא for פֹּה only here, and doubtless only a *lapsus calami* for it. 𝔊 *ἐν σεαυτῇ*, as Be.[K] saw, expresses בְּכֹה misread as בְּכָה: but this can hardly be the original reading; for (1) the repetition

of the same word פא is much more forcible; and (2) בְּכֹה for כֹּה is dubious: it occurs only 1 K. 22[20] (twice), where the sense is not *here*, but *thus* (*in this wise . . . in that wise*), and where the ‖ 2 Ch. 18[19] has כָּכָה . . . כָּכָה, as can hardly be doubted, rightly.

12. המימיך] for the idiom (= since thou wast born), see 1 S. 25[28], 1 K. 1[6]; and cf. on 27[6]. 𝔊 ἢ ἐπὶ σοῦ συντέταχα (צויתי) φέγγος πρωινόν; where, according to Bi. Be., ἐπὶ σοῦ = מִמְּךָ; but ἐπί with a gen. is a common Greek idiom for *in the time of*, *e.g.* ἐπὶ Κύρου, ἐπ' ἐμοῦ, ἐφ' ἡμῶν, etc.

ידעתה] in poetry the Kt. יִדַּעְתָּה שחר is preferable to the Qrê יִדַּעְתָּ השחר. The Pi. יִדַּע only here; perhaps (Bu.) to be read in Ps. 104[19] שמש יִדַּע מבואו.

13. רשעים] an עַיִן תְּלוּיָה—one of the four *litteræ suspensæ* (the others being v.[15], Jg. 18[30] מנשה, Ps. 80[14] מיער)—probably due to the fact that the scribe of the standard MS wrote by error רשים; the ע was afterwards inserted above the line, and when copies were made the peculiarity of the standard MS was scrupulously reproduced (cf. G–K. 5*n*; or, more fully, Ginsburg, *Introd. to the Heb. Bible*, p. 334 ff.).

14. ויתיצבו] viz. objects on the earth. Be., cleverly, וְתִצָּבַע or וְתִצְטַבַּע, *and it* (the earth) *is dyed* (cf. צֶבַע, Jg. 5[30]; צָבוּעַ, *variegated*, Jer. 12[9] †) like a garment: in the light of day the earth appears, as it were, draped in the marvellously varied hues of foliage and flowers (so Bu.). Of vv.[12-15] Hfm. (and following him Sgf. Du. Che. Be.[T] Vo.) omits [13b] and [15]; and Du. Che. Be. Vo. [14b] as well for the sake of the tetrastich—Du.'s view being that the original tetrastich consisted of v.[12a. b. 13a. 14a], v.[13b. 14b. 15a. b] being a tetrastich written originally on the margin, which afterwards found its way into the text (in [14b] Hfm. Du. Be. Honth. read לְבֹשֶׁת for לְבוּשׁ, "and they stand there as if ashamed (*wie zur Schande*") with their faces, viz., reddened in the crimson glow of sunrise, after which they quickly vanish into darkness, [15a]. But [15] upon this interpretation does not follow [14b] well; while at the same time (Di.) [13a. 14a] assign a very poor purpose for [12]). The ground for these excisions is that at the Creation no wicked yet existed. But, as Bu. remarks, the reference is not to the Creation, but to any day

in human history, even (v.[12]) within Job's lifetime, in which the light of day is represented as having this wonderful moral effect of purging the world from the godless.

16. נבכי] etymology unknown (Arab. *nābik* is a *lofty place*; *nabakat*[un], a *hill with a pointed top; intabaka*, to *be lofty*; نبج is *erupit, orsus est, evasit*, of *light, flowers*, etc., and نبجا is *surculus, virgultum* βλαστός (PS. 2265 f.); but these words throw no light on the etymology of נֵבֶךְ); but, si vera l., 𝕲 πηγή seems to express the right meaning. The word being doubtful, Bu. suggests, very plausibly, נִבְעֵי (cf. Syr. ܢܒܥܐ = πηγή), *flowing springs* (cf. נַחַל נֹבֵעַ, Pr. 18[4]); Che. מַבֻּעֵי (Is. 35[7] 49[10]).

חֵקֶר] = *range*: see on 11[7]; and cf. Ps. 95[4] מֶחְקְרֵי ארץ.

17. וְשַׁעֲרֵי צלמות] 𝕲 πυλωροὶ δὲ ᾅδου = וְשֹׁעֲרֵי צ׳, and the *gate-keepers* of darkness,—adopted by Du., to avoid the repetition of the same word שַׁעֲרֵי: "though we hear nothing of the nature of the beings who guarded the entrance to שאול, 'gates' necessarily presuppose gate-keepers." [The repetition of the same term is certainly improbable here; but accidental repetition may have extruded some other term synonymous in meaning, but quite different in form from שערי; cf. 8[8] *n*.]

תראה] 𝕲 ἰδόντες σε ἔπτηξαν; apparently a double reading רָאוּ and יראו (יִרְאוּ)—the ת dropped by haplography. [Read רָאוּךָ or רָאֻתָה—either a good parallel to נגלו לך: the impf. תראה is scarcely suitable.]

18. התבוננת עד] hast thou *shewn thyself attentive as far as, even to* . . .? But, perhaps, על (= אל) should be read, as 31[1], Ps. 37[10] (so Bu.).

כֻּלָּהּ] 𝕲 πόση τίς ἐστιν, whence Du. Be. כַּמָּה, "how much it (the earth) is." But the change is unnecessary; it is not apparent why כֻּלָּהּ (Du.) "klingt ziemlich kindisch."

19. הדרך] Be. Bu. דֶּרֶךְ, and so [24]; but אי זה הדרך seems to have been idiomatic: see 1 K. 13[12], 2 K. 3[8], 2 Ch. 18[23] †: it is not likely that dittography should have taken place *five* times in the same expression.

20. תקחני] Be.[K] תַּנְחֵנוּ. 𝕲 εἰ ἀγάγοις με; and so Me. Sgf. תקחני (Oo. תַּנְחֵנִי): a fine piece of irony. But 𝕸 is more probable; and also, as Bu. observes, more forcible.

תבין] תָּבִין דַּרְכָּהּ occurs in 28^{23}; but probably Hfm. (תְּבִיֵן), Du. Bu. Be. are right in reading תְּבִיאֶנּוּ, ‖ to תקחנו.

21. רבים] by attraction to ימיך: cf. 21^{21} and G–K. 146*a*.

22b. ואוצרות] [the repetition is improbable (cf. 8^3 n.): the lost term was perhaps מזו (37[9] n.)]. Du. וְאוֹצְרֵי, *treasurers* (Schatzmeister), for the same reason as וְשֹׁעֲרֵי in [17]. But the point here is Job's seeing the *treasures*, not their *treasurers*.

23. קְרָב] Ps. 55^{21} 68^{31} 78^9 144^1, Zec. 14^3, Qoh. 9^{18}† (in 2 S. 17^{11} rd. with 𝕲𝕾𝖁 קִרְבָּם). The common Aram. word for *war*.

24. הדרך] see on [17].

אור] light has been dealt with in [19]; even lightning (which אור denotes in the Elihu speeches) is mentioned in [25b]; אור seems consequently out of place here. Ew. (*Die Salom. Schriften*, p. 252), Me. Bi.[1] Wr. St. Bu. רוּחַ; Hfm. Bi.[2] Du. (see the next note), Honth. אֵד, *mist* (36^{27}); Sgf. כְּפֹר, *hoar-frost* (after 𝕲 πάχνη (see [29b]); cf. Sir. 43^{19} καὶ πάχνην ὡς ἅλα ἐπὶ γῆς χέει = (marg. יִשְׁפֹּךְ) (וגם כפר כמלח ישכן); Be. קִיטוֹר, *steam* (after 𝕲 πάχνη in Ps. 118 (119) [83]). Of these suggestions רוח, agreeing with the ‖ קדים, is the most probable; אד is palæographically easier; but neither this, nor כפר (which in addition comes in [29]), nor קיטור (Gn. 19^{28}, Ps. 148^8 119^{83}†), has the importance of wind (which, moreover, is not likely to have been omitted in the questions put to Job, and which agrees also best with יְחַלֵּק [cp. En. 41^4 60^{12}], as well as with the ‖ קדים).

יָפֵץ] Rd. probably יָפִיץ: הפיץ is always *causative*, except here, Ex. 5^{12}, 1 S. 13^8 (read in each וַיָּפָץ).

קדים] Du., objecting that the "wind" is here out of place (?), and that the way of the "east wind" *is* known, declares that קָרִים, "cool (water)," of *fine* or *drizzling rain* ("Sprühregen"), for קדים is "necessary"; he thus (with אֵד and יָפֵץ, *trans.*) gets, "Where is the way by which the mist is parted, (And) diffuses fresh water on the earth?" the allusion being to

"the refreshing fine rain, which in summer the morning mist brings with it, when it is dispersed." But קרים (*sc.* מים) does not seem a good expression for *fine* rain; nor do Jer. 18^{14}, Pr. 25^{25} (מים קרים) show that קרים alone would be used for cool water. And as Du.'s objections to רוח do not seem decisive, קרים is no longer a necessary emendation. [Honth., following Du. in [24], transposes vv.[24] and [25]. Retaining אור in [a], Richter proposes קרנים (cp. Hab. 3^4, and the vb. in Ex. 34^{29})—scatters the *rays* over the earth.]

26. לא איש] see on 12^{24} בתהו לא־דרך (G–K. 152*u*).

27. שֹׁאָה וּמְשֹׁאָה] see on 30^3.

ולהצמיח מֹצָא דשא] and to cause the place where young grass cometh forth to sprout: מוצא דשא, like מוצא מים, and (implicitly) מוצא כסף, 28^1. But the v. is much improved by reading with Wr. (so Bu. Du. Be.^{T}) צָמֵא for מצא (note the ‖ to שאה ומשאה): and to make *the thirsty land* (Is. 44^3 RVm.) sprout with young grass (הצמיח, with a double accus., as Ps. 147^8 המצמיח הרים הציר). Be.^{K} St. מִצִּיָּה, *out of the dry ground*; also a good suggestion.

28. A beautiful verse, rejected, however, by Bi.[2] Du. Che., partly as tautologous with [29], and partly as not fitting into [25] (which, however, refers not to ordinary rain, but to the downpour in a thunderstorm), and (?) the scheme of the tetrastichs.

אגלי טל †] 𝔊 βώλους δρόσου; 𝔖𝔗𝔙 all *drops*. This must be the meaning; but the etymology is obscure. Arab. *'ajala* is to *confine* or *restrain*, *e.g.* cattle from their pasture (Lane, 25), ii. *congregant*, *collegit*; *ma'jal*, *stagnum*, *piscina* (Freyt.); ? אֵגֶל = *drop* as a small quantity of fluid, *collected together*.

30. כאבן מים יתחבאו] "like stone are the waters hidden," "as (with) stone (G–K. 118*s*) are the waters hidden" (RV.), are both unsatisfactory; "hide themselves (and become) like stone" is forced; "are solidified (sich verdichten; RVm. *are congealed*) like stone" (Di. Del.) gives יתחבאו a meaning which it does not possess. These difficulties are removed, and justice is done to the words used, if with Me. we suppose the two verbs to have become accidentally transposed [cp. Is. $2^{2f.}$ = Mic. $4^{1f.}$; *Forms*, p. 296], and accordingly interchange them;

we then get, "Like stone the waters *cohere together* (poet. for *freeze*: lit. *take hold of* or *grasp one another*: cf. 41^{9} †, of the scales of the crocodile, יתלכדו ולא יתפרדו; and התלקח, Ex. 9^{24}, Ezk. 1^{4} †), and the face of the deep *is hidden*" (viz. by the ice forming upon it): so Bi.[1] Sgf., Bu. Hi. Hfm. Du., keeping the verbs as they are, take יתחבאו as an alternative or dialectical form of יתחמאו (denom. from חֶמְאָה, *curdled milk*) *are curdled*, or *coagulated*, if not (Du.) יתחמאו is to be read: but this is precarious; and does חמאה, *leben*, curdled milk (see on 20^{17}) coagulate in a manner at all resembling ice?

31. [התקשר] in Is. 49^{18} קשר (‖ לבש) means *to bind on*, *engirdle oneself with* (cp. קשרים, *sashes*): hence Me., Wilt thou engirdle thyself with the beauty of the Pleiades: "the Pleiades are the delightful girdle which engirdles God, not Job." But the idea is not a good parallel to that of ᵇ, and קשר being here ‖ to פתח is rather *to bind fast* (cp. 39^{10} 40^{29}—Qal), *to bind up*, *fasten*; cp. קֶשֶׁר, *a knot* in P.B.H.]

[מעדנות] the same form, מַעֲדַנֹּת, recurs in 𝔐, in 1 S. 15^{32} †; in 1 S. the word has been variously explained as meaning (1) *voluptuously* (EV. "delicately"), so 𝔗 'A: "not probable in view of the context" (Dr. *ad loc.*); (2) *in fetters* (so Qi.); and, pointing מְעֻדָּנֹת, (3) *totteringly*: "so Sm. Now. Dh. Ehrlich, probably rightly" (Dr. *ib.*). Thus the passage in Sam. can at best lend a very dubious support to any theory of the meaning of the present passage. And the Massora notes that in 1 S. 15^{32} and here מעדנות has different significations. As to the present passage there are two main theories: (1) that מעדנות means *delicacies*, *dainties*: this would be the most obvious meaning of the word if the parallel and context really admitted it: cf. the masc. pl. מַעֲדַנִּים, *dainties*, in Gn. 49^{20}, La. 4^{5}, Pr. 29^{17} †, and, perhaps, Jer. 51^{34} (though מעדני is otherwise pointed in 𝔐); עדינה, *voluptuous*, Is. 47^{8}; עדנים, *pleasures*, Ps. 36^{9} and, as pointed, Jer. 51^{34}. The *delicacies* of כימה (commonly, though not universally, identified with the Pleiades) have been understood to be the fruits, or flowers, of spring, or the renovating influences of spring which produce them: so here Levi b. Gershon (A.D. 1326), who remarks מעדנת שם מיני תענגים שימצאו בסבת כימה ר״ל בהמצא השמש שם כי אז יתיר הזמן האילנות ויתנו

פרים, and in the previous century Nachmanides had given as a minority interpretation האתה תקשר מעדנות פירות מזל כימה כי רצונו לקשר הפירות שהם המעדנים. Thence some of the 16th century versions: *e.g.* Oecolampadius (1532), "Num conjunges delitias Cimo," with the note, "septem stellæ sunt . . . aerem calidum pluviis temperant, *et terram pulchris floribus* ornant"; Seb. Münster (1535), "Numquid tu ligabis suaves influentias Pleiadum," whence the Great Bible (1539) and the Bishops' Bible (1568), "the sweet influences of the seven stars," and the Genevan Bible (1560) and AV. (1611), "the sweet influences of the Pleiades"; a note in the Genevan version runs, "which stars arise when the sun is in Taurus, which is the spring time, and bring flowers." Dr., in a printed but unpublished note, dated Oct. 22, 1882, after citing the above comments and versions, together with many others, observes "the heliacal rising of the Pleiades (*i.e.* their rising so as to be visible shortly before sunrise) is well known to have been noted by classical writers [cp. 9^9 exegetical n.] in connection with spring, just as the setting of Orion at the same time was regarded as a signal of the approach of winter. And a comparison of the 16th century versions makes it clear that this is the sense to be attached to the first clause of our version [*i.e.* the AV.] . . . it does not, as is often supposed, allude to any astrological power exercised by the stars, but is a poetical figure expressive of the renovating influences that operate in spring." For another interpretation of מעדנות meaning delicacies, see last n. Nothing satisfactory resulting from this meaning, מעדנות is now commonly taken as equal to, or an error for, מענדות (cp. the vb. ענד in 31^{36a} and ‖ to קשר, Pr. 6^{21}): but this is then differently interpreted (1) as something consisting of separate units bound *together*, a *cluster* (RV.), or (2) as something bound *upon* a person, whether as an ornament, such as a *necklace* (Hi., who compares عقد, from عقد, similar in meaning to ענד), or, for purposes of restraint, *fetters* (cp. 𝕲 δεσμόν, 𝕿 שירי). The last seems preferable in the context.]

[משכות] Be.[K] מֹסְרוֹת, substituting a known term for a ἅπ. λεγ., for a noun משכה occurs here only; משך is *to draw, drag*

along: cp. especially Is. 5^{18}, Hos. 11^{4}, to draw along (with cords); the noun משכות should thus mean either the things (cords, ropes, chains, etc.) which drag some one or some thing along; or the things which one draws along after one, such as an ornamental chain (so Ar. مسكة, of an ornamental arm or foot-chain); but not very probably *a girdle* (Hi.). N. Herz (*JThS* xiv. 576) detects in משכות an allusion to Egyptian, such as some find in תמשך in 40^{25} (see n. there). In Egyptian the Great Bear is depicted as the haunch: Herz cites from the Book of the Dead as cited in Brugsch (*Thesaur. Inscr. Aegypt.*, p. 122), "As regards the msχt constellation, it is the haunch (χps) of Typhon, it exists in the northern sky." This, as well as the suggestion that כסיל as a Hebrew term for a constellation means not *fool* but *haunch* (cp. כֶּסֶל), would be more acceptable, if Herz's efforts to derive עיש (equated with Sirius) and כימה also from the Egyptian could be considered successful.]

32. מזרות †] [the following בעתו suggests that 'מ is the name of a single star or constellation rather than (as the plural might indicate) of several separate and distinct stars, though even this is not conclusive for the suffix might have a distributive force (G–K. 145*l*, *m*)—*the Mazzaroth, each in its season*; cp. Σ (cp. $\mathfrak{S}^{H}$ = 'A) *τὰ σκορπισθέντα κατὰ καιρὸν αὐτοῦ ἕκαστον*. From the present passage little else can be inferred. Identifications rest, therefore, on etymological speculations. Ibn Ezra (on 37^{9}; cp. Hoffm. in *ZATW* iii. 108) equates מזרות with מזרים (37^{9} n.), itself very doubtful and obscure. In recent times a more popular equation has been with מזלות in 2 K. 23^{5} (𝔊 there, as Θ here, *Μαζουρωθ*: 𝔗 here שטרי מזלייא); but מזלות is also uncertain, some translating *the planets*, others *the signs of the zodiac* (Ges. *Thes.* 869; RV. margin); in Rabbinic Hebrew the word is used with both meanings (Levy, *NHWB*; Burney on 2 K. 23^{5} and in *EBi.* 4782 f.). 𝔙 here *Lucifer* (with *Vesper* for עיש): cp. the explanation of מזרות as = מזהרות (*plural*) = Ar. الزهرة = Venus (*singular*!). Others (Mich. Ew.) again make מזרות = מנזרות, and cp. נזר, *a crown*: hence Corona Borealis, or both the Northern and the Southern Crowns. 𝔖

ܥܓܠܬܐ, the Wain, as = the great or little bear. All most uncertain].

[עיש על בניה] if = ʿAyish *with* her children, cp. the use of על in Gn. 32[12], 1 S. 14[32]: *Lex.* 755*b*.]

[תַּנְחֵם] so 𝕸, עיש על ב׳ being a *casus pendens*. Other possible pointings are (1) תְּנֻחַם; על is then *for* (the loss of): cp. 1 Ch. 19[2], Jer. 16[7]: (2) תָּנִיחֵם, but הֵנִיחַ in the sense *to give rest to, bring to a resting-place*, is elsewhere construed with ל, and is commonly used only of the settlement of the Israelites in Canaan (Ex. 33[14], Dt. 3[20] +): otherwise as an antithesis to תוציא it might be considered.]

33. הידעת] Du. Be. הֲיִדַּעְתָּ (v.[12]): but (Bu.) this is against both the order of the words and the bare חקות; we should expect, if that were the sense intended, הֲיִדַּעְתָּ שמים חקותיו.

מִשְׁטָרוֹ] The √ שטר, elsewhere in Heb. only in שֹׁטֵר, Ex. 5[6] etc., which denotes plainly some kind of subordinate official, employed partly in the administration of justice, partly in the maintenance of civil order and military discipline; and in a fig. sense, Pr. 6[7] (see Dr. on Dt. 1[15]); but the etymological sense is uncertain. In Ass. *shaṭâra* is to *write* (Del. *HWB* 651 f.); in Arab. *saṭara* is to *write*, to *rule* (a book); *saṭr* is a *line* (of writing), a *row* (of trees, buildings, etc.); and *misṭarat*[un] is an instrument for *ruling* a book (Lane, 1357*f.*). [The Sabæan *sṭr* is an *inscription* (*CIS* iv. 99[10]): in Syr. ܫܛܪܐ is a *hand-writing*, or *deed*.] If the sense of שָׁטַר was to *write* (as in Ass.), שֹׁטֵר will have meant properly, *writer, registrar*; but if the primary sense of the √ was to *range in order* (Nöld. *Gesch. des Qorans*, p. 13), and this was retained in Heb., שֹׁטֵר will have meant *arranger, organiser*, and so we get for מִשְׁטָר here the sense of *ordered arrangement*, or, briefly, *rule*. [But Schwally in ed. 2 of Nöld. *Gesch. des Qorans*, p. 16, traces back the Arabic and Syriac words cited above without doubt to the Assyr. šaṭâra, *to write*; the Heb. שטר he also regards as derivative from Assyr., and compares the "nicht ganz sicher zu deutende" מִשְׁטָר.] F. Del. *sein Sternenzelt*, or, as we might say, *its starry canopy*, from Ass. *šiṭir šame*, the *writing of heaven, i.e.* the starry firmament (*Comm.* p. 170; *HWB* 652[b],

cf. 18^{7a}); but this is far-fetched, and על הארץ rather than בארץ would be expected. [The sing. suffix in משטרו refers to שמים (pl.) regarded as a ruler (so Di. after Ew. 318^a; Ehrlich: משטרך; preferably, if conjecture is resorted to, we might read משׁטְרֵי ארץ, משטר being a synonymous parallel to חקות.]

34. ושפעת מים תכסך] exactly as 22^{11b} (though there in a fig. sense); cf. also Is. 60^6 שפעת גמלים תְּכַסֵּךְ. 𝔊 (ὑπακούσεταί σου) תַּעֲנֶךָּ; so Bi.[1] Du. Be. Che. St. Bu. This undoubtedly agrees well with ^{a}, and תכסך may be due to a scribe's recollection of 22^{11} and Is. 60^6: on the other hand, 𝔊 *may* also be a paraphrase; the use of the same expression in different passages of the same poet is not conclusive against its originality here—there are many cases in Homer, and an excellent one in Virgil; and, after all, the feature of the volume of water *covering* Job, in response to his (imagined) invitation, is finer and more effective than *will answer thee.*

36. בטחות] [so 12^6 where ב is radical, and Ps. 51^8 where it has generally (but see Briggs, etc.) been taken to be the prep. 𝔊 for ב' חכמה has γυναιξὶν ὑφάσματος σοφίαν, reading perhaps בטוות. 𝔗 בכוליין and 𝔙 *in visceribus hominis* (cp. 𝔖 ܒܟܘܠܝܬܐ) anticipate the subsequently dominant theory that טחות both here and in Ps. 51 is a term for the *reins* or *inward parts* of men, as something that is covered over or coated (√טוח), viz. with fat (Ibn Ezra on Ps. 51). Since Schultens, many, on account of the context, have conjectured that here (though such a meaning is, of course, out of the question in Ps. 51) טחות refers to some natural phænomenon, Schultens himself, comparing طاح, to lose one's way, طحا, to carry away, proposed, *wandering motions* (*e.g.* of lightnings, thunders, rains); others, *clouds* (Eichh.), *dark clouds* (Hrzl. Hitz. Di. RVm. Peake, al.; cp. طخا, *to be dark*, with derivatives meaning *darkness*, and *clouds*), or *cirrus-clouds*, "which are wont, as with white, chalky plaster to overlay the blue heaven" (Du.: cp. טוח, *to overlay*). Unfortunately the parallel term is, if possible, even more uncertain; if, however, שכוי is an animal, טוות (𝔊) may be an epithet (*the weavers*) for another, *e.g.* the spider—suggested though not adopted by Du.].

שֶׂכְוִי] [if correctly preserved and punctuated and not a foreign (Egyptian: Hoffm.) word, the root is שכה = שכו: in Hebrew this appears only in (1) מַשְׂכִּית, which may mean *an object to look at*, and is used with reference to specific objects in Nu. 33^{52}, Pr. 25^{11}, and of the imaginations (of the heart) in Ps. 73^{7}, Pr. 18^{11}; and (2) the doubtful שכיה of Is. 2^{16}. In Aramaic, on the other hand, the root is in frequent use; שכא = Hebr. צפה, *to look out, keep watch*; consequently שכוי might mean, like the Aramaic סַכְוָאָה (= צֹפֶה, *e.g.* 𝕿 Is. 21^{6}), *watchman, observer*: hence it has been translated 1. *the mind*: as "*videns, imaginans*, vel *intelligens*" (Ges. *Thes.*); so 𝕿 (first rendering), 𝕾 (ܣܘܟܠܐ), Ibn Ezra, EV., Ges.; 2. *the cock*, as the watchman, or prophet, among birds: cp. *Rosh hash-Shanah*, *26a*, "When I came to Teḥum-Kēn-Nishraya, R. Simeon b. Lakish said that" the cock was there called שכוי, *Wayiḳra Rabba*, c. 25: in Arabic the cock is called סכוא: *ib.*, "in Arabic the prophet is called סכיא"—all cited by Del. This translation is adopted by 𝕿 (second alternative), 𝔙, Rashi, Del. (3) By giving to the noun a passive sense, which is, however, not so natural to the form, the meaning *something seen*, (celestial) *phænomenon* is obtained: so Schultens; and similarly or with reference to some specific phænomenon, Ew. (*Glanzgestalten*), Me. (*Lichtblitz*) Hi. and Bu. (*Luftgebilde*), Di. (*Wolkengebilde*), RVm. (Meteor), Du. (the Aurora Borealis)].

37. יְסַפֵּר] so, in the sense of *count*, Ps. 22^{18}. The Piel may have an intensive sense to *count busily* or *exactly*; but more probably יִסְפֹּר, אֶסְפֹּר should be read. Du.'s objections to "count" are hypercritical, and it is strange that Peake should attach any weight to them: the question is, of course, merely a rhetorical way of asking whether Job has that minute knowledge of the clouds, and of the laws by which [b] they are employed for the production of rain, when [38] it is needed, which would enable him to regulate their movements and use. יִפְרֹשׂ, *spread out*, for יספר is thus quite unnecessary.

38. בְּצֶקֶת] from יצק intrans., as 1 K. 22^{35} וַיִּצֶק דַּם־הַמַּכָּה.

לַמּוּצָק] lit. *into something cast* (of metal, 1 K. 7^{37} מוּצָק אחד; c. 37^{18} ptcp. כִּרְאִי מוּצָק), *i.e.* into a *compact mass*. Not as Du. [(see exegetical n.)].

ורגבים] 21^{33} †. The line is short: Grimme, cleverly and neatly, ורגבים בִּרְגָבִים ידבקו: so Bu.

ידבקו] cf. 41^{9} איש באחיהו יְדֻבָּקוּ.

39. חַיַּת כ׳] חַיָּה = *appetite*: see on 33^{18}. Cf. Pr. 6^{30} לְמַלֵּא נפשו.

40. במעונות] Ley, Be.[K] בִּמְעוֹנוֹתָם, after 𝔊 ἐν κοίταις αὐτῶν, though whether 𝔊 *read* the sf., is more than we can say.

בַּסֻּכָּה] סֻכָּה is elsewhere a *booth*; for *covert*, *lair*, we have elsewhere סֹךְ, Ps. 10^{9} (יארב במסתר כְּאַרְיֵה בְסֻכֹּה), 76^{3} (סֻכּוֹ, of Yahweh, under fig. of a lion; ‖ מְעוֹנָתוֹ), Jer. 25^{38} עזב ככפיר סֻכּוֹ. Be.[K] בַּסְּבָךְ (Gn. 22^{13}), as Giesebr. in Jer. 25^{38} סֻבְּכוֹ (as Jer. 4^{7}), and Lag. Che. We. in Ps. 10^{9}.

לְמוֹ] 27^{14} n.

אָרֶב] 37^{8} † [in a different sense].

41. יכין] *provide*, as Gn. 43^{16}, Ps. 65^{10} 78^{20}.

לערב] The raven, it has been urged, comes in unsuitably among the quadrupeds; its proper place would be beside the hawk and the eagle, 39^{26-30}. Hence Wr. Bu. Be. לָעֶרֶב, *in the evening*, the whole v. now referring to the lion, a reference to the lion being supported further by the similarity of thought and partly of expression with $4^{10.11}$, Ps. $104^{20.21}$ (especially [21b] with [41b]), and the punctuation לְעֹרֵב of 𝔐 being explained as due to recollection of Ps. 147^{9b} לבני עֹרֵב אשר יקראו. However (Bu.) מי יכין suggests here a new beginning; the suffix in צידו can hardly refer back beyond כפירים to לביא; and the mention of the raven here is sufficiently explained by the similarity of the Divine action, in providing food for its young, as for the young lions, [39b].

יתעו] the young ravens, fed by their parent, are presumably in the nest: how then can they "wander" about? it is hardly probable that they are supposed to have left their nest, and so wander about for food on the ground. Bi. Bu., therefore, may be right in reading יִתְעֶה, the sg. referring to the parent-bird, and the plur. being due to the influence of the preceding ישועו: the raven (*NHB* 199) frequents desolate places, its food is there scanty and precarious, and it has to fly far and wide in search

of it. Be. יפעו, referring to ילדיו (Syr. to *bleat*, of sheep, but also used of children crying for their mother, PS. 3201, in Talm. also of human beings, *ChWB* ii. 280*b*; in OT. כיולדה אֶפְעֶה, Is. 42^{14} †: *not* "Aram. for יִפְצוּ" (Bu.), for there is no trace of an Arab. نفى (with ض, *Lex.* 821*a*; cf. on 4^{10}): if we were sure that פעה was used of the cry of a bird, this would be better than יתעה.

לבלי אכל] the ל of norm or state, like לבטח, לבדד (*Lex.* 516*a* i); *in the condition of foodlessness*; לבלי, as 41^{25}, Is. 5^{14} לבלי חק † (cf. . . . לְאֵין often in Chr.). 𝔊 πλανώμενοι τὰ σῖτα ζητοῦντες, whence Du. לְבַקֵּשׁ for לִבְלִי; then, with לָעֶרֶב (see above) in ^{41a}, and referring all to the lion, he completes the tetrastich (after ישׁעו) by reading (cf. Ps. 104^{21}) הכפירים ישאגו לטרף יתעו לבקש אֹכֶל:.

CHAPTER XXXIX.

1. הידעת] Du. הֲיָדַעְתָּ (38^{12}), as 38^{33}.

עת לדת] [The two words are rhythmically superfluous and have perhaps intruded here from ^{2b}]. Bi.[1] Bu.[1] Be.[K] (with ?) St. om. עת (dittogr.), removing the somewhat inelegant anticipation of עת in ^{2b}; but Bu.[2], after Grimme, om. instead לדת, as a gloss on עת, and in fact an incorrect one, עת (with the masc. יעלי) referring not to the time of the female's *bearing* (which follows in ^{b}), but to the time of heat in the male (Be.[K] תַּאֲנַת (Jer. 2^{24} תַּאֲנָתָהּ מי ישיבנה) for עת לדת). Du. הֲיִדַּעְתָּ עַשְׁתְּרוֹת יעלי סלע, "Lehrtest du Liebeslust die Steinböcke?" 'ע, the peculiar expression used in Dt. 7^{13} $28^{4.18.51}$ † עַשְׁתְּרוֹת צאנך, ‖ שְׁגַר אֲלָפֶיךָ, where, however, it is far from clear that it means specifically "Liebeslust." With the text as it stands, יָעֵל, though masc. in form, must, of course, be supposed to be epicene, and to denote actually the female.

חלל] inf. Po'lel of חול, as Is. 51^{2} al.; and in the pass. 15^{7}, ולפני גבעות חוללת.

תשמר] שמר, to *mark*, *observe*, as $13^{27} = 33^{11}$, 1 S. 1^{12}, Zec. 11^{11}.

2. תמלאנה] מִלֵּא, of completing a period of time, as Gn. 29^{27}; cf. in Qal, Gn. 25^{24} (וימלאו ימיה ללדת), al.

וידעת] Du. ויעדת, and *appointest*.

לְדְתָּ֫נָה] G–K. 91*f*, where five parallels are quoted; add א(ו)תָ֫נָה, Ex. 35^{26}, Ezk. 34^{21}.

3. תפלחנה] [rhyming with תשלחנה in ^{b}]. פָּלַח is to *cleave*, Ps. 141^{7}; so פִּלַּח, c. 16^{13} al. Here, if correct, the Pi. must have a causative sense, *cause* their young to *cleave open* (the womb); [cp. בִּקַּע, of *hatching* eggs, Is. 59^{5}]. But פִּלַּח does not occur so elsewhere: and it is highly probable that (Ol.) תְּפַלֵּטְנָה should

be read: cf. 21[10]; and the syn. הִמְלִיט, Is. 66[7]; מִלֵּט (of laying eggs), Is. 34[15]: ΘΣ *διασώσεις αὐτά* also presupposes the ט (תְּפַלְּטְנָה).

חבליהם] [rather than *birth-pangs* (21[17] n.: sing. חֵבֶל, Is. 66[7]), ח' may here mean *fœtus*, like the Arabic حبل, and be from a sing. חֶבֶל. In any case the sense of pain does not regularly attach to the root even in Heb., for the vb. means simply *to be pregnant with* in Ca. 8[5], Ps. 7[15]: so in Arabic حبل is *to be pregnant*; احبل, *to fecundate*; حبلى, *pregnant*. Cf. Barth. *Wurzeluntersuchungen*, 15; Schulthess, *Homonyme Wurzeln im Syrischen*, 25*f*. Ehrlich transfers ילדיהן to the end of the v., makes חבליהם the obj. of תפלחנה, and renders, they separate their own navel-cords—in which he sees the one wonder of the wild goats]. חבליהן (so 11 MSS) would be the correct form: but in the term. of 2nd and 3rd pers. pl. of verbs, and the pron. sf. of the same persons, the masc. form often appears: cf. [4] 1[14]; and see G–K. 135*o*. Du. om. ילדיהן [which stands in 𝔐, without adequate reason, *before* תפלחנה] as a (correct) gloss on חבליהם, rendering, they bow down, they cleave open (the womb). "The asyndeta in [3. 4a] strengthen the impression of care, security, and swiftness, which the description is intended to convey" (Du.). [The rhythm of [3] in 𝔐 is 3 : 2 (17[14] n.); with the omission of ילדיהם it is 2 : 2: this, in Job very rare (19[14] n.), rhythm may have been deliberately chosen to heighten the sense of swiftness.]

4. יחלמו] *are healthy*; Is. 38[16] †, Hif. תחלימני. The Ethp. and Af. are common in Syriac in the senses *recover health*, and *heal*, respectively: see 2 K. 1[2] 8[8], ܐܬܚܠܡ; ܐܚܠܡ, Hos. 5[13], Jn. 5[15].

ירבו] [one MS[Ken.] ילכו: cp. 𝔙 *pergunt*. For the meaning *to grow up*, see Ezk. 16[7]: it is common in Aram.; see in 𝔗 Gn. 21[8] 25[27] 38[11], Ru. 1[13] (all = Heb. גדל): Pael, Jb. 38[27] (= להצמיח)].

בַּר †] *open field* or *country*; an Aramaism: Dn. 2[38] חֵיוַת בָּרָא (= Heb. חַיַּת השדה); and in 𝔗 בברא, 2 K. 10[24], Is. 42[2] (= Heb. בחוץ). [One MS בבר, 𝔙 *ad pastum*. AV. "with corn," after

Seb. Münster (*frumento*) and mediæval Jewish interpreters (see Wright and Hirsch) who gave to בר the sense it has, *e.g.*, in Ps. 65^{14} 72^{16}. בבר or some other word in the line may be corrupt or intrusive; for the rhythm of 𝕸 is 4 : 3 (17^{14} n.). 𝕲𝕾 om. [b]; but this scarcely represents the original text.]

ולא שבו למו] למו might, of course, mean *to them*; but more probably, perhaps, the ל is the reflexive ל (*Lex.* 516*a*), as 6^{19} 12^{11}, Ps. 80^{7} etc., "*sibi* h. e. sui iuris esse volentes" (Schult. *ap.* Del.); so Hi. Del.

5. שלח] שלח חפשי, as Ex. $21^{26f.}$ (לחפשי), Dt. $15^{12f.\ 18}$, Is. 58^{6}, Jer. $34^{9-11.\ 14.\ 16}$ of men.

ערוד †] the Aram. syn. of פרא (עֲרָד †, Dn. 5^{21}; ܥܪܳܕܳܐ). The word "may be derived from عرد, to *flee in fear*, *flee away* (Labîd [25]); though more probably (D. H. Müller) from غرد, 'schreien,' which is also used of the wild-ass, Amrualqais 4^{21}, Zuhair 1^{25}" (Nöld. *Fünf Moʿallaqât*, ii. 75).

7. תְּשֻׁאוֹת] *loud shoutings*, as Zec. 4^{7}. See on 36^{29}.

8. יְתוּר †] as pointed, a rare nominal form like יְקוּם (G-K. 85*d*): but it is far better to point (after Θ κατασκέψεται, 𝕿 יְאַלֵּיל, 𝖁 circumspicit) יָתוּר, *spies out*, *explores* (Nu. $13^{2.\ 16.\ 17}$ etc.), with Ew. Hi. Bu. Du. etc.

9. רֵים] for רְאֵם = רֵאם (Ps. 92^{11} רְאֵים); cf. רָמִים, Ps. 22^{22} (G-K. 23*e*, *f*). Baer and Ginsb. read רֵים; G-K. 22*s*, 20*f*; Dr. *Sam.*[2] p. xx [Assyr. *rêmu*, Ar. رِئم; but of these, the latter at all events is applied to an animal not corresponding to the Hebrew descriptions of the ראם; see exegetical n.].

10. התקשר רֵים בתלם עבתו] Ha. Stick. "in *or* to the furrow *with* his cord" (the accus. of the instrument), is questionable, in spite of Mic. 7^{2}; Di., better, "in the furrow of his cord," *i.e.* in the furrow which his cord limits him to: but this is forced; rd. rather, with Sgf., בתלם בַּעֲבֹתֹת (Bu. בַּעֲבֹתוֹ): this yields, by legitimate Hebrew, with a very slight change, the sense required: for התקשר רֵים read also (Bu. Du. Be.) התקשְׁרֶנּוּ—the repetition of רים after [9] is inelegant, and 𝕲 has only δήσεις δὲ ἐν[; התקשרנו also restores the normal 3 : 3

rhythm]. Du. החקשרנו בַּעֲבֹת תַּלְמוֹ, "by the cord of his furrow," which also yields a good sense. Be. would read for the v. הֲתִקְשֹׁר בְּעָנְקוֹ עֲבֹת אם ישׂדד תְּלָמִים (תלמיך or) אחריך (עֲנָק), cf. Heb. עֲנָק, assumed to correspond to Aram. עֻנְקָא, *neck* (though not the usual word), Ps. 69[4] 𝕿 al. and Talm., Arab. *'unq*); but the change of text is violent, and insufficiently supported by 𝕲 (*δήσεις δὲ ἐν ἱμᾶσι ζυγὸν αὐτοῦ, ἢ ἑλκύσει σου αὔλακας* [= תלמים in 31[38]; but the word may here be a paraphrase] *ἐν πεδίῳ*;) and 𝕾 (ܕܬܐܣܘܪ ܪܝܡܐ ܢܝܪܐ ܥܠ ܨܘܪܗ ܘܢܕܒܪ ܐܘ ܢܕܪܘܟ ܢܕܒܪ ܓܒܠܬܐ ܒܦܩܥܬܐ), both of which in [a], not less than in [b], are strongly suggestive of paraphrase.

12. כי ישׁוב] *that* he will, etc., the כי stating the obj. of the trust (Ew. § 336*b*; G-K. 117*h*). With the athn. at זרעך, the Kt. ישׁיב must be read; and in [b] גרן will mean the contents of the threshing-floor (cf. Ru. 3[2] והנה הוא זֹרֶה את־גֹּרֶן השׂעורים): but the v. is very unevenly divided; probably the athn. should be put at ישׁוב, and [b] should read (or אל גרנך, or לגרנך, or גָּרְנָה) חרעך גרנך יאסף; so Me. (אל ג'), Bi.[1], Bu. (גרנה; so Du.), St. (לגרנך), Be.[K] (either גרנך, or גרנה, or לגרנך). גָּרְנָה avoids the repetition of the ך-. Be.[T] ישׁיב, *bring back*, the object following in [b]: this may be right; ישׁיב (*sc.* זרעך) would be more naturally said than ישׁוב. 𝕲 here expresses 𝕸 (with ישׁיב).

13. כנף] [if the section was part of the original text, read הַכְנַף (הֲ followed by אם, as in [9f.]). In 𝕳, v.[18] proves an exception to the otherwise unbroken rule that the sections treating of animals begin with an interrogative particle].

רְנָנִים †] *shrill* or *piercing cries*: if correct, a poet. name for the bird which emits them, the ostrich. Hfm. Bu. Du. Be.[K] יְעֵנִים (cf. La. 4[3] Qrê כַּיְעֵנִים במדבר). 𝕲 *τερπομένων* (רְנָנִים). *'A αἰνούντων*, *Σ ἀγλαϊσμοῦ*, 𝕾 ܢܥܡܝܬܐ, 𝖁 struthionis, 𝕿 תרנגל ברא (38[36]). Qi. AV. *peacocks*.

נעלסה] עלס (not עלז, or עלץ), as 20[18] (Kal), Pr. 7[18] † (Hithp.).

אם אֶבְרָה חסידה וְנֹצָה] Is it a kindly pinion and feather? אברה, *pinion*, Dt. 32[11], Ps. 68[14] 91[4] †; אֵבֶר, Ps. 55[7], Is. 40[31], Ezk. 17[3] †; נֹצָה, *plumage*, Lv. 1[16] †; נוֹצָה, Ezk. 17[3. 7] †. In חסידה, [if

rightly read], there is doubtless an allusion to the bird called חסידה [Lv. 11^{19} Ps. 104^{17}, Jer. 8^{7}, Zec. 5^{9}], *the kindly one*; the stork, so called on account of its affection for its young. Bu.[1] would make it named distinctly: אם אֶבְרַת חסידה ונצה, Is it the stork's pinion and feather? (or rather: Is it a kindly bird's—with only an *allusion* to the stork—pinion and feather?). Bu.[2] thinks that Hfm. has "perhaps" seen rightly in reading (what he rejected in his first ed.) נֶעֱצָלָה for נעלסה in ^{a}, and in ^{b} אם אברה חֲסֵרָה ונצה, "Is the wing of the ostrich sluggish? (Nif., as Jg. 18^{9} †; עָצֵל, often in Prov.), Or is pinion and feather lacking (to it), That she leaveth her eggs to the earth," etc.? Does its wing move so slowly, or are its feathers so deficient, that it cannot itself defend its eggs, but must leave them on the ground, where (v.[15]) they are exposed to many dangers? חָסֵר in actual usage means only *in need of*; but חָסֵר means to *be lacking* (1 K. 17^{14}), as well as to *lack* (be in need of), so that the adj. may mean similarly *lacking*, *deficient*. Ley, Be.[K] ("perhaps") נִקְלָסָה and חֲסֵרָה: The wing of the ostrich is mocked (2 K. 2^{23} *al.* Hithp.), Is (its) pinion and feather lacking? [Du., retaining חסידה in ^{b}, proposes נָלוֹזָה, *perverse*, in ^{a}: Ehrlich as Du. in ^{a}, but in ^{b} אִם אַכְזָרִיָּה חסידה, making חסידה mean *ostrich* (a view long since refuted by Bochart), and omitting ונצה as a gloss on אברה. Wr. retaining ^{a}, though translating it interrogatively, read in ^{b} אם תאבר חסידה ונץ.]

14. תעזב] רננים (if correct) being construed, according to its meaning, as a fem. sg. (cf. תהו construed as a pl. 1 S. 12^{21}; נפש, *person*, after an opening clause, construed as a masc., Lv. 2^{1} $5^{1.2}$ etc.; Ew. § 318*b*—where, however, some of the examples are textually doubtful; cf. G–K. 124*b*, *n*.).

תחמם] Be. Bu. תְּנַחֵם. This is an excellent ‖ to תעזב [and expresses the obj. which in 𝔐 must be understood]: at the same time, תחמם may stand; for the ostrich does sit upon the eggs.

15. ותשכח] Bu. וְתִשְׁכַּח.

תְּזוּרֶהָ . . . תְּדוּשֶׁהָ] the fem. suffix referring to the collective ביצה. There are many cases of this, where the pred. is a *verb* (G–K. 145*k*): the cases are rarer, and not all textually

certain, where the fem. is a suffix (G–K. 135*p* (where *dele*, p. 441, l. 2, as due to an oversight, "but previously תַּחְמָם"); Kö. 348*g*, *h*: thus 2 K. 3^{8} 13^{11} 17^{22} 𝕲 has חַטָּאת, and probably the sg., in spite of 𝕲's pl., should be read similarly in $13^{2.6}$; 2 K. 10^{26} Vrss. מַצֵּבַת; Is. 35^{7} rd. רִבְצָם: cf. on c. 6^{20} 14^{19}).

16. הִקְשִׁיחַ] Is. 63^{17} †. The masc. is, however, intolerable with what follows: rd. either (2 MSS, Hirz. Di. Be.[K] St.) תַּקְשִׁיחַ, or (Ew. Di. alt.) הַקְשֵׁחַ (inf. abs.; G–K. 113*s*). The perf. הִקְשִׁיחָה (Hi. Sgf. Du.) agrees less well with the impf. in [14].

לְלֹא־לָהּ] הקשיח לְ can only mean "hardeneth (= useth hardly) her young ones (making them) *into* none of hers" (*Lex.* 519*b*), לְלֹא לָהּ expressing the result of the action הקשיח. This might be the sense intended; but if it is thought that "useth them hardly *as if* they were none of hers," is more probable, then כְּלֹא לָהּ must be read (so Oo. Be.[K]); חשב לְ (13^{24} 19^{15} etc.), lit. *think into* (= *esteem to be*), is not a ‖ for so rendering הקשיח לְ. לְלֹא לָהּ is poet. for לַאֲשֶׁר לֹא לָהּ (G–K. 155*n*, *d*); cf. Hab. 2^{6} הַמַּרְבֶּה לֹּא־לוֹ, who increaseth (what is) *not his*, and c. 18^{15} מִבְּלִי־לוֹ (Gn. 15^{13}, Jer. 5^{19}, Hab. 1^{6}, where לֹא לָהֶם, לֹא לָכֶם, לֹא לוֹ are preceded by a *subst.*, are different).

בְּלִי פַחַד] בלי is properly a *substantive*, like אַיִן; hence, followed by a gen., *naught of* . . .; and so here *naught of fear*! (There is) *no fear*! It is not, as in previous cases, joined closely to a subst. (38^{2}), or adj. (33^{9}), or verb (8^{11}), and so cannot, as there, be rendered *without*.

17. בַּבִּינָה] the ב partitive; cf. 7^{18} 21^{25}.

18. כָּעֵת בַּמָּרוֹם תַּמְרִיא] כָּעֵת (abs.) occurs here, Nu. 23^{23}, Jg. 13^{23} 21^{22} (where, however, rd. כי עתה). It has been rendered (1) *Now* (cf. כַּיּוֹם); so Nu. 23^{23} (Di. Gray), Jg. 13^{23} (Moore); (2) *At the* (*right*) *time*, *zur Zeit* (𝕲 κατὰ καιρόν, 𝔙 cum tempus fuerit; so Hi. Del. Di. here; Knob. Keil, Kuen. in Nu. 23^{23}); and (3), as = כעת אשר, At the time when . . . (Hirz. al.; Ew. § 337*c* (*a*), and Comm. ("Wann sie einmal . . ."): so EVV. *What time* . . .); though it is better in this case to point כְּעֵת (Me. Du.): כְּעֵת is followed by an inf. (1 S. 4^{20}); and there is no reason why it should not, in poetry, like כְּעֵת (Jb. 6^{17} בעת יזרבו), be followed by an impf. This yields a satisfactory sense: there is no

point in *Now*, and *At the* (right) *time* is a doubtful rendering of כָּעֵת.

במרום] Hi. Du. בַּמֵּרוֹץ, *in* (her) *running* (Qoh. 9^{11} †); and for כעת במרום, Wr. Bu. Be.[K] Honth. כָּעֵת בא מֹרִים, "At the time when archers (2 S. 11^{24}) approach." But במרום is far more picturesque; and it is gratuitous to change it: the "height" denoted by the word may vary with the context: though often used of the height of heaven, it cannot denote a very great height in Jg. 5^{18}, Pr. 8^{2} 9^{3}; in Ps. 73^{8} it is said of proud men that they ממרום ידברו: a little hyperbole may also be reasonably granted to the poet: and surely the line, as it stands, gives a fine and true description of the great bird, taller than a man, bounding along at full speed, with its wings flapping vigorously, and taking gigantic strides,—it may be (*NHB* 237) of 22–28 ft. —and moving so rapidly that (Wood, *Natural History*, vol. on Birds, p. 647) its feet seem hardly to touch the ground.

תמריא †] مرى is *ad vehementiorem cursum scutica aliave re egit* equum (Freyt., Hi. cites also Grangeret, *Anthol.* p. 42); here it may be rendered *spurs* (fig.) *herself*,—the wings flapping vehemently against the ostrich's body in her flight being, as it were, the goad urging her on (Ges. *Thes.* "*Hiph.* de struthione, qui e nido exsurgens alarum plausu tamquam flagello, ad cursum se impellit"). [Be.[K] weakly תְּמַהֵר.]

19. רעמה †] רעם is *thunder*; but that (in spite of AV.) is impossible here. Ges. *Thes.* conjectured for the √ the meaning *commotus est, tremuit*, which he adopted for Ezk. 27^{35} (רָעֲמוּ פנים; ‖ שָׂעֲרוּ שַׂעַר), and also for Ps. 96^{11} (= 1 Ch. 16^{32}), 98^{7} (*commotum est* mare); so Del. Di. ("Gezitter") and RV. "the *quivering* mane" (with marg. "Heb. shaking"). The rendering of RV. is fine, and suggests a picturesque image; but unfortunately the sense is doubtful: it has no philological support; and noise, not movement, seems to be the idea expressed by רַעַם, רָעַם (Ezk. 27^{35} rd. probably רָמְעוּ for רעמו). The VV. obviously guess: 𝔊 φόβον (so Saad. *ra'ab*, fear), Σ κλαγγήν, Θ χρεμετισμόν, 𝔖 ܐܘܠܠܐ, Jer. 𝔙 *hinnitum*: 𝔊 would suit, were the sense established; 𝔖 is arbitrary; the other renderings do not suit תלביש. Honth. Be.[K] עָצְמָה, *strength*, forms a good ‖ to גבורה; 𝔗

תוקפא expresses the same sense, though it would be precarious to argue that the translator *read* anything different from 𝔐.

20. התרעישנו כארבה] הרעיש cannot mean "make to leap"; רעש is to *shake* (intrans.), *e.g.* of heaven, earth, nations, etc., shaking — through an earthquake (רַעַשׁ), terror, or Yahweh's appearance, etc.; cp. רַעַשׁ, of the *quivering* of a dart, Jb. 41^{21}; of a horse eager to start, 39^{24}; here, therefore, seemingly of the *quivering* of eagerness and excitement as the animal leaps along. [Ehrlich: התעשׁינו כָּאֲרֻבָּה, dost thou make him to smoke (cp. 41^{12}) like a chimney?]

הוד נחרו אֵימָה] the subst. אֵימָה by Dr. § 189. [Ehrlich, חֵד (Ezk. 7^7) for הוד]; Bi. Du. needlessly, הוד נַחֲרָה אֵימָה (cf. Jer. 8^{16} מִדָּן נשמע נַחֲרַת סוסיו), "(in) the majesty of (his) terrible snorting," [or the majesty, etc., if with Du., ^{20b} is placed after ^{19a} as a second obj. to התתן. The transition from the interrogation in ^{20a} to description in ^{20b} in 𝔐 as commonly understood (*e.g.* RV. "the glory of his snorting is terrible") is in any case improbable. Bu. makes the whole v. interrogative by treating ^{b} as a circumstantial clause, and taking הוד as well as אימה as pred.—His snorting being majestic, terrible, *i.e.* with majestic, terrible snorting].

21. יחפרו] Rd. with 𝔊𝔖𝔙, Di. Bu. etc. יַחְפֹּר. Wr. Bi. Bu. Du. Be. Ehrl. place the ־ at וישׂישׂ (so 𝔊). [With the meaning *to paw*, here only in the OT., cp. حافر, *hoof*.]

22. לפחד] 𝔖 ܠܐ ܡܣܬܘܕܐ; so 3 MSS לְפַחַת, "at the pit," adopted strangely by Be.^{K}.

23. תִּרְנֶה] if correct, רָנָה † will be a by-form of רָנַן, of which there are traces in Arab. (Ges. *Thes.* s.v.); but possibly תָּרֹן should be read. [Scarcely תָּרֹנָּה (fem. pl.: Ehrlich), for analogy before such a compound subj. requires the sing. (G–K. 146); Bu. Be.^{K} (?) תתן הא': but the art. is improbable.] The Arab. *ranna* (= רנן), to *utter a cry*, esp. a *plaintive* or *mournful cry*, is in ii. and iv. used of the *twanging* of a bow (Lane, 1164*b*).

לַהַב] [*Flashing* (point): cp. Nah. 3^3, Jg. 3^{22}: להבת, 1 S. 17^7. Bu. לָהַב or לְהֵב, spear and javelin *flash*: but we should expect the impf.; Umbr. Ha. (cited by Di.) obtained the same

sense by taking the noun לחב predicatively (cstr. according to Dr. § 189: cp. [20b]).

24. [ברעש ורגז] רעש is not "fierceness" (EVV.), but (see on v.[20]) *shaking*, *quivering* (*Lex.* 1127*b*), and רגז (see on 3[17]) is strong *agitation*, not necessarily "rage"; the two alliterative words denoting the violent trembling of the animal in its eagerness to start, and to take its part in the fray.

[יְגַמֶּא ארץ] גמא, to *swallow*; Hif. Gn. 24[17] † הגמיאני נא מעט מים: NH. גמא (*NHWB* i. 339; cf. 𝕿 גמע, below, v.[30a]). For the fig. cf. the Arab. التهم الفرس الارض (cited by Ges. *Thes.* from Schultens), "*deglutivit* equus terram," and *lahim*[un], *lihamm*[un], cito *deglutiens*, as an epithet of a swift horse, "equus *haustor*" (*ib.*); and Catullus, 35. 7, "viam vorabit." [On יגמֶא for יגמא, see G–K. 75*oo*, cp. 74*d.*]

[ולא יאמין] Rabb. EVV. Hengst. Dav. And believeth not that it is the sound of the trumpet, *i.e.* for joy believeth not his own ears when he hears it. But Ges. Ew. and moderns generally (so RVm.), And *standeth* not *still*, lit. *showeth* not *firmness*, understanding האמין in its primary, physical sense, which is still seen in Qal אָמַן, to *support* (bring up, nourish), אֹמֶנֶת, a *foster-mother*, *nurse*; in Nif. to *be supported* (Is. 60[4] ובנותיך על צד תֵּאָמַנָה), *confirmed* (Is. 7[9] כי לא תֵאָמֵנוּ: see *Lex.* 52 f.); אֹמְנָה, a *support*, *pillar*, 2 K. 18[16]; and in אֱמוּנָה in Ex. 17[12] ויהי ידיו אמונה. It cannot, however, be said that this sense is altogether satisfactory; in particular, to *show firmness* is not quite the same thing as to *stand still*. Hence Bi. יִפָּנֵא, *letteth itself* not *be held* back; Du. Honth. Bu., somewhat prosaically, ולא יֵימִן ולא יַשְׂמְאִיל, and goeth not to the right or to the left, —Du. then making a new distich בדי (or ירקד) כי קול שֹׁמֵר יָעֹר שופר יאמר האח, When the watch (Jg. 7[19]) calleth out, he stirreth himself up, As oft as the horn (soundeth) he saith, Aha! But "believeth not" is preferable to any of these alternatives. [Still it remains very improbable; כי קול שופר looks like a mere variant of בדי שופר: and it is possible to restore the succession of distichs not only by additions to the text such as Du. makes, but by the simple omission of [24b].]

[כי קול שופר] It is tempting (with the second sense of

יאמין) to read בְּקוֹל (Bi. Bu.); but בְּ in a temporal sense (= *at*) is very rare except with an inf. (Is. 18[5]), or verbal noun (*Lex.* 454*b*, 3b), Is. 23[5] being probably the only example. בְּקוֹל ש׳ (Be.[K] Bu. alt.) never occurs in the sense of "*at* the sound . . .": but . . . לְקוֹל would be in accordance with usage (Nu. 16[34], Is. 30[19], Ezk. 27[28]).

25. בְּדֵי] elsewhere (in the sense here required) always מִדֵּי, *out of the sufficiency of* = *as often as*, sq. an inf. or subst. (Is. 66[23], Jer. 48[27]; *Lex.* 191*b*); and this, no doubt, should be read. On the very frequent confusion between ב and מ in 𝔐 and 𝔊 and other versions, see Dr. *Sam.*[2] lxvii.

יריח] Wr. Bi. Du. think the fig. unsuitable; and so Wr., with 1 MS, יריע [rather תָּרִיעַ], "And the battle sounds afar"; Du. (who objects in particular to the cries of the captains being "scented") בְּרֶעַ (36[33], Mic. 4[9]) for רעם: He scenteth the battle from afar, *at the shout*, etc. But the passage is not prose, but poetry; הריח is widely used in Heb. (*v.* on 14[9]); and רעם ת׳ is merely the further development of the idea of מלחמה. Cf. Pliny, *HN* 8. 42 (Bochart) "Iidem *præsagiunt* pugnam."

26. מבינתך] *from, out of, through* thy understanding: *Lex.* 580*a*, e*b*.

יַאֲבֶר †] *useth* (or *moveth*) *its pinions* in flight: denom. from אֵבֶר, pinion, v.[13] n.; [not *plumescit*, 𝔙].

27. [יגביה] = יגביה עוף, 5[7] (Di.); Jer. 49[16] would suggest taking קנו in [b] as obj., but this would be rather flat. Possibly the text is corrupt: see next n.]

וכי] either (cf. [a]) = ואם על פיך כי; or independently, *Or* (is it) *that* . . .: (cf. Is. 36[19]; הֲכִי, c. 6[22], 2 S. 9[1], Gn. 27[36]; *Lex.* 472*a*). But the line is a little short: so St. Bu., plausibly, וכי יָכִין בֶּהָרִים קִנּוֹ. Du. (who has to reduce the 10 lines [20–30] to two strophes of 4 each) omits יגביה נשר, and in [28] (with Bi.) סלע ישכן, as glosses suggested by Jer. 49[16], treats וכי as dittographed from פיך, and carries on מצודה (in the sense of prey) (Ezk. 13[21]) to [29]: he thus gets for [27f.] אם על־פיך ירים קִנּוֹ ויחלן על־שן סלע (so Be.[K], except that he retains מצודה where it is). [The excellent parallelism of Du.'s emendation contrasts with what appears to be faulty in 𝔐: note the two parallel terms ישכן

and יחלון in a single line: and again שן־סלע and מצודה in another, not to speak of the repetition of סלע and the awkwardness of [27b]. This at least is a better way of obtaining two quatrains than the omission of v.[30] (Bi. and ? Di.).]

29. משם חפר אכל] Du. מצודה משם חפר (אכל added after מצודה, misunderstood to mean fastness, had been taken back to [28]).

למרחוק] 36[3].

חפר] as 11[18].

יביטו] the *masc.*, by G–K. 145*u*.

30. יְעַלְעוּ] no √ עלע is known; but Syr. ܠܥܣ, ܠܥܣ, is to *lick* or *lap up*, 𝔖 Jg. 7[5. 6. 7], 1 K. 21[19] (= Heb. יָלֹקּוּ), 4 Mac. 10[17] ܠܥܣ ܕܡܐ = *αἱμοβόρος*; and Ob.[16] לָעוּ is to *gulp up* (or *swallow down*): rd., therefore, either יְלַעְלְעוּ (Ges. Ol. Del. Di. etc.) or (Bu. alt.) יָלֹעוּ.

CHAPTER XL.

2. [הרב עם־שדי יסור] according to 𝔐, רֹב is inf. abs. taking the place of a finite vb. in an indignant question (cp. Jer. 3[1], G–K. 113*cc*), with its subject יִסּוֹר † (a nominal form like שִׁכּוֹר, גִּבּוֹר) following (G–K. 113*gg*), and separated from it by intervening words. For the last point, cp. Lv. 6[7] הַקְרֵב אתה בני אהרן (but S הקריבו, 𝔊 = יקריבו): Nu. 15[35] רגום אתו באבנים כל העדה (S רגמו). The VV. do not recognize this punctuation, but find in רב a noun (רִב, *κρίσις*, Θ), a part. (רָב, *ὁ δικαζόμενος*, Σ, דנצי, 𝔗), or an adj. (רַב, ܣܓܝܐܐ, 𝔖); and in יסור a verbal form (יָסוּר, *ἐκκλινεῖ*, Θ, 𝔙 conquiescit: Σ *περιγενήσεται*; 𝔗 יתרדי = ? יוסר), or another nominal form (? סוּר: ܡܠܟܘܬܐ, 𝔖). Ehrlich רִב with יְסוֹר, *Is the contention . . . at an end* (סוּר, as Is. 11[13]).]

[יענגה] G–K. 135*p*.]

5. [אחת . . . שתים] G–K. 134*r*, *s*: cp. Ps. 62[12], and see on 33[14].]

[ולא אענה] 𝔊 om. For אענה read אֶשְׁנֶה (cp. 29[22]): so Hitz. Di. Dr. Du. Bu. al.]

7. See on 38[3].

8. [האף] cf. 34[17].

9. [כאל] for what should logically be כזרוע אל, acc. to a well-known Heb. idiom (*Lex.* 455*a*). So בְּקֹלוֹ for כמו קולו.

10. [גאון וגבה] [Alliteration, as in [b] הוד והדר.]

11. [גֵּאֶה] for the form, see G–K. 84[b] *c*.

11b–12a. 𝔊 *πᾶν δὲ ὑβριστὴν ταπείνωσον, ὑπερήφανον δὲ σβέσον*. Du. remarks that 11[b] and 12[a] have in 𝔐, evidently through a mistake, the same beginning, while 𝔊 has a change: he would read, therefore, "naturally only at random (aufs Geratewohl)," וכל נאה השפילהו: רְאֵה גֵּבֶהּ הכניעהו.

12a. הכניעהו] 15 MSS. 'וה (the renderings of 𝔗𝔙 do not show that they *read* the ו), which would be better.

12b. הדך †] Ar. *hadaka* is to *fall down* (of a building); cf. הָרַס, fig. Is. 22[19], Ps. 28[5]. Still, the word is an uncertain one in Heb.: and Hfm. Bu. would read הֲדֹךְ, *crush*, from דָּכַךְ, which is presupposed by דַּךְ, but does not occur elsewhere in Heb., and occurs only rarely (Levy) in 𝔗 (*e.g.* Jb. 4[19] Pa., 34[25] Ithpa., Ps. 143[3] Palpel), and there not in Afel. Gr. Du. suggest הֲדֹף—but only for those who are doubtful about the ἅπ. λεγ. הדך. הדף, however, is to *push aside* or *away*, and would agree poorly with תחתם.

תחתם] 𝔊 παραχρῆμα,—no doubt a paraphrase. Bu. תחתיך, "and crush the wicked *under thee*": suitable in itself, but unnecessary: תחתם in its idiomatic sense of *where they stand* (Ex. 16[29], Jos. 6[5], 2 S. 2[23] ויפל שם וימת תחתיו, Jer. 38[9] וימת (rd. וָמֵת) תחתיו, and especially Is. 25[10] וְנָדוֹשׁ מואב תחתיו) is very forcible.

13. פניהם] [𝔊𝔖𝔙 supply the conjunction—ופניהם].

חבוש] חבש is used specifically of binding something round the *head* (*e.g.* Ex. 29[9]).

[טמון] Ehrlich בַּלְמָם: in 𝔐 the last echoes the first word of the v.]

14. גם] the גם *correlativum*: see *Lex. s.v.* גם, 4.

15. הנה נא] 33[2] n.

[בהמות] 𝔊 θηρία, 𝔗 בעירא; 𝔙 *behemoth* (and so 𝔖): if pl. of בהמה, an intensive pl. (G–K. 124*e*), meaning here (differently from Ps. 73[22]) "a colossal beast" (Che. *EBi.* 519; Kön. *Wörterbuch*). No more satisfactory etymology has been suggested; it would not have been surprising to find here an Egyptian term; but the known Egyptian term for the hippopotamus (*rert*) has no resemblance to בהמה: and there is no evidence that the often cited *p-ehe-mou* ever existed. It is barely possible that the Hebrew term for hippopotamus was "Swine from, or of, the water": *EBi.* 2073.]

אשר עשיתי] 𝔊 omits; so Me. Bi. Sgf. Du. Be., partly on the ground that [15a] is too long, partly (Du.) on the hypercritical ground that "made like thee" is absurd: "like thee,"

however, does not here mean *resembling thee*, but *equally with thee*. On the other hand, "is *beside thee*" is not unsuitable; for the meaning then would be (Du.) that the animal was *beside* Job, so that he could readily learn from it the lesson intended. The words must stand or fall according to the less or greater rigidity of the poet's metre. Me. Sgf. omit עמך as well; but then (Bu.) they lose the support of 𝔊, and the line becomes too short.

16. שרירי] only here: cf. שׁר, *navel-string*, שרשרה, *chain*: from √ שרר common in Aram. in the sense of *be firm*, *strong* (cf. Heb. שְׁרִירוּת, *firmness* in a bad sense, *stubbornness*). Wetzstein (*ap.* Del.), however, would render *supports* of his belly (*i.e.* the bones of the loins and shoulders), connecting שריר with Arab. *sarîr*, a *support* on which a thing rests; but the Arab. usage, as given in Lane (1338*b*), a *thing upon which one lies or sits*, a *couch-frame*, *bedstead*, *throne*, etc., does not suggest anything resembling the *supporting bones* of an animal's body.

17. יחפץ] from חָפֵץ † = خَفَضَ, to *lower*, *depress* (*e.g.* wings, Qor. 15^{88} 17^{25}), *bring down*, *abase* (Qor. 26^{3}, the day of judgment will *abase* the proud); here, it seems, somewhat more generally, to *bend* (חָפֵץ, to *desire* = خفظ, to *be attentive to*, is a different root altogether: Dr.[3] § 178, pp. 226, 231).

פַּחֲדָיו (dual)] = أَفْخاذ, *thighs* (Aram. פַּחְדִּין, *testiculi* = אֶשֶׁךְ, Lv. 21^{20} 𝔗; and so 𝔙 here nervi testiculorum eius perplexi sunt).

18. גרמיו] גְּרֵם is the common Aram. word for *bone* (*e.g.* Dn. 6^{25}, Gn. 2^{23} 𝔗), but rare and poet. in Heb. (Gn. 49^{14}, Pr. 17^{22} וְרוּחַ נְכֵאָה תְּיַבֶּשׁ־גָּרֶם, 25^{15}, 2 K. 9^{13} [?] †). How it differs in meaning from עֶצֶם is uncertain: RV. *limbs*, RVm. *ribs*; Hi. Bu. Che., after 𝔊 (ῥάχις), render *his spine*, observing (Hi.) that this is favoured by the sing. מטיל, and regarding the pl. גרמיו as referring to the separate vertebræ: but there is no support for this rendering: the poet is hardly likely to have thought of the separate vertebræ; in a comparison there is no difficulty in the sing. מטיל; and the Syriac Hex. expresses ῥάχις by the specific ܚܘܛܪܐ ܕܚܨܐ the *backbone*.

מטיל †] the √ in Ar. is to ***hammer out*** (? a secondary root from طال, to be long, Del.); and Ar. ***mamtûl*** is iron, or a sword, ***beaten out into a long shape*** (Lane, 3021; cf. also the *Lex.* of Neswân, as cited by Del.); hence מטיל, a ***bar*** of metal. Cf. 𝕿 מְטַל, 1 S. 17[6] (כִּידוֹן נְחֹשֶׁת = מְטַל דִּנְחָשָׁא), and here (מְטָלְיָא דִּנְחָשָׁא, (variants מטלנא, בְּמַטְלוּתָא, a ***weight***): Levy, *ChWB.* ii. 28*a*, *b*). 𝕲 *σίδηρος χυτός*: Σ *ὡς συμβλήματα σιδηρᾶ.*

19b. (1) 𝕸, in view of the ***jussive***, יַגֵּשׁ, can only be correctly rendered, "Let him that made him bring near his sword (to attack him)!" הָעֹשׂוֹ (if the ***active*** ptcp. is right; but *v.i.* (3) and (4)) will be an anomalous form for הָעֹשֵׂהוּ (cf. the rare רֵעוֹ by the side of רֵעֵהוּ: Kö. 303*i*); and as the art. with a ptcp. naturally excludes a ***nominal*** sf. in the ***genitive*** (G-K. 116*g* n.), the וֹ— will be the ***verbal*** sf. in the ***accusative*** (as in הַמְאַזְּרֵנִי חיל, Ps. 18[33]. הַמַּכֵּהוּ, הַמַּעַלְךָ, etc.: G-K. 127*i*; Kö. *l.c.*). Cf. הַיֹּלְדָהּ, Dn. 11[6]. (2) The common rendering (which properly requires יַגִּשׁ for יַגֵּשׁ) is (cf. 𝖁 qui fecit eum applicabit gladium eius), "He that made him ***bringeth near*** his sword, *i.e.* furnishes him with it (so RVm.), the 'sword' being taken as a poetical term for the powerful weapon which the hippopotamus possesses in the formidable array of long spear-like incisors and curved chisel-edged canines or tusks" (cf. Hdt. ii. 71, *χαυλιόδοντας φαῖνον*), which "root up rank grass like an agricultural implement" (*Encycl. Brit.*[10], *s.v.*, p. 722*b*), and "sever, as if with shears, a tolerably stout stem" (Woods, *l.c.* p. 761 f.). And Nicander (*Theriaca*, 566 f., *ap.* Bochart, ii. 761) describes these teeth as a ***ἅρπη*** (***sickle***): *Ἢ ἵππου τὸν Νεῖλος ὑπὲρ Σάϊν αἰθαλόεσσαν Βόσκει, ἀρούρῃσιν δὲ κακὴν ἐπιβάλλεται ἅρπην*; cf. Nonnus, *Dionys.* xxvi., *Αἰχμῇ καρχαρόδοντι διασχίζων ῥάχιν ὕλης.* But to ***bring near***, like an offering, or an article for food or use (1 S. 13[9] 23[9], 2 K. 4[5], Gn. 27[25]), is not a natural expression to use of what is an integral part of the animal's frame. (3) 𝕲 has *πεποιημένον ἐγκαταπαίζεσθαι ὑπὸ τῶν ἀγγέλων αὐτοῦ* (cf. the addition in 41[25] 𝕲) = הֶעָשׂוּי לְשַׂחֶק־בּוֹ, ***that is made for him to play with***, *i.e.* to be Yahweh's plaything (*ὑπὸ τῶν ἀγγ. αὐτοῦ* being a readily intelligible paraphrase for *ὑπ' αὐτοῦ*): cf. (upon

one view of its meaning) Ps. 104[26] לִוְיָתָן זֶה יָצַרְתָּ לְשַׂחֶק־בּוֹ (𝔊 ὃν ἔπλασας ἐμπαίζειν αὐτῷ). So Me. Bi.[1]. [In favour at least of the pass. part., note הֶעָשׂוּ in the similar v. 41[25].] (4) Hfm. (1890) emended הֶעָשׂוּ יִגַּשׁ חָרָבוֹ, *which is made that he should draw near to* (?) *His dry land* (?), improved somewhat by Gunkel, *Schöpf. u. Chaos* (1895), p. 62, to (sic) הֶעָשׂוּי יִגֹּשׁ חָרָבוֹ', *which is made that he should govern the* (sic) *dry land*, and by Giesebrecht (in a review of Gunkel's book, *GGA.*, 1895, p. 595) to הֶעָשׂוּי יִגֹּשׁ חֲבֵרָיו, "*that he should govern* his fellows," *i.e.* the other animals. נָגַשׂ, however, in the few cases in which it occurs as a verb in Qal, is a strong word, meaning not to *govern*, but to *press hard*, as a debtor, Dt. 15[2. 18], or workman, Is. 58[3]; hence Du.'s הֶעָשׂוּי נֹגֵשׂ חֲבֵרָיו (Che. *EB.* 521, better, לְנֹגֵשׂ), *to be governor of*, etc., is preferable, syntactically as well as in meaning; for נֹגֵשׂ, though it is the word used of a *task-master* (Ex. 3[7] al.), and signifies properly a *hard, exacting* ruler (Is. 3[12] 9[3] 14[2. 4], Zec. 9[8]), expresses the idea of *governor*, at least in late Heb. (Zec. 10[4]—perhaps also Is. 60[17]), without apparently this bad connotation. Bu., though he leaves the line untranslated, seems (p. 245) to think this emendation probable. The thought certainly (Du.) forms a good parallel to [a].

20. כי בול הרים ישאו לו] בול for יְבוּל: note the preceding י. נשא, *bring = bear*; cf. of a tree, Hag. 2[19] al. (*Lex.* 671*a*, 2g), of the mountains, as here, Ps. 72[3] יִשְׂאוּ הרים שלום לעם. כי, *for*, however, agrees only with (2) in v.[19] (*v. supr.*), which, however, we have seen to be improbable. Perhaps יִשָּׂא לו, *For the produce of the mountains he taketh to himself* (Du.), is right; Be.'s objection that יקח לו would be expected in this sense is hardly cogent. Wr. for הרים would read יארים, and Sgf. נהרים, and Giesebr. for [a] כִּי בֵּין נְהָרִים יֵשֶׁב־לוֹ: but none of these suggestions agrees with [b]; the beasts of the field do not "play" in the rivers. In [b] Du. continues וכל חית השדה יְשַׁחֵק [21] וְשָׁם, "And all the beasts of the field *he crusheth*, [21] *And there*," etc. (שָׁחַק, as Ex. 30[36]†; common in Syriac, and often for συντρίβειν): this would be a proof of his dominion over other animals (v.[19b]), and agree with נֹגֵשׂ. Still, in this line there seems to be no sufficient reason for deserting 𝔐: such a strong term is hardly

here expected; and דִּכָּא is the usual Heb. word for expressing the idea. [If v.[20] gave proof of behemoth's dominion, [a] as well as [b] probably expressed this: so Gu. (*Schöpf. u. Chaos*, 64), who regards כל חית השדה as subj. of ישאו: note also ישעו for ישאו, proposed with a ? in Be.[K].]

21. צאלים] v.[22] †; = Ar. ضَالٌ = Syr. ܨܐܠܐ, like אֶרֶץ = أَرْض = ܐܪܥܐ; see Dr., *Tenses*, p. 223.

בצה] *swamp* or *swampy ground*: 8[11], Ezk. 47[11] † (cf. בֹּץ, a *swampy bottom, mire*, Jer. 38[22] †): 𝔗 בִּיצָא, 8[11]; Is. 14[23] (ביצין = אַגְמֵי מים = דמין), al.

22. צִלְלוֹ] for the normal צִלּוֹ, with resolution of the duplication, as נֶלְלוֹ, 20[7] (n.); צִלְלֵי, Jer. 6[4]: cf. עֲמָמֵי, הֲרָרֵי, etc. Note assonance with צאלים, as [if correctly read] of יסכהו with יסבהו. Syntactically, צללו is an accus., defining in what capacity the lotus-trees cover him, "*as* his shade." [But this is rather pointless, the repetition (after [21]) of צאלים and the similarity of יסכהו in [a] to יסבהו (cp. 8[8] n.) in [b] suspicious. For יסכהו צאלים Du. proposes וסך נעצוצים.]

23. יעשק] עשק is everywhere else a trans. verb, meaning to *oppress, wrong* (*e.g.* Am. 4[1]),—a very doubtful figure to use of a river. The sense *exorbitare* (*sc.* extra viam) is imaginary: this is cited by Hi. (from Willmet) for عَسَفَ, which does mean to *turn aside* from the way, and also to *act unjustly* (Lane, 2044): but it is cited by Del. (seemingly by an oversight) as the root-meaning of עשק, عَسِقَ, which really signifies *adhæsit, assiduus, deditus fuit* rei: to *exceed bounds, behave immoderately and violently*, first in a physical and then in a moral sense, is consequently a purely imagined meaning for עשק. The text is thus very doubtful. Du. יָשׁוֹק, *dashes* (*heranstürzt*), the idea being not that of the rising Nile, but that of a mountain (Palestinian) stream, swollen by a sudden storm, dashing, like a wild animal (Pr. 28[15]), against the sleeping monster. יָשׁוֹק will, however, come not (as apparently Du.) from שׁוק, to *overflow* (Jl. 2[24] והשׁיקו היקבים תירוש, 4[13], Ps. 65[10] פקדת הארץ וַתְּשֹׁקְקֶהָ, *and makest it to overflow* †), but from שָׁקַק, Ges. *discursit, dis-*

cursitavit, of locusts, Jl. 2^9 בָּעִיר יָשֹׁקּוּ, Is. 33^4 כְּמַשַּׁק גֵּבִים שֹׁקֵק בּוֹ, "ad instar *incursionis* locustarum *incurrit* in eam" (prædam), Nah. 2^5 of chariots, *rushing* or *dashing to and fro*, בחוצות יתהללו הרכב יִשְׁתַּקְשְׁקוּן ברחֹבות: in Pr. 28^{15} אֲרִי נֹהֵם וְדֹב שֹׁקֵק מושל רשע על עם דל, the sense *ranging* (EVV.—suggesting a more staid movement than is denoted by שקק), or *stürzt sich* (Du.), for שֹׁקֵק seems less probable than that which—however obtained—שׁוֹקֵקָה has in Is. 29^8, Ps. 107^9, viz. *eager for food* (so Ges. Del. Frankenberg). These are all the occurrences of שקק: the cognate languages fail us: and the *exact* shade of meaning expressed by it, or whether it would have been used of water *dashing* against anything, we do not know. 𝕲 has ἐὰν γένηται πλήμμυρα, whence Be. יִשְׁפַּע *overflows*. שָׁפַע itself does not occur in the OT., though the derivatives שֶׁפַע (Dt. 33^{19} †) שִׁפְעָה (22^{11} 38^{34}, 2 K. 9^{17}, Is. 60^6, Ezk. 26^{10} †) do, but mostly in the fig., not the lit. (so only Jb. 22^{11} 38^{34} שפעת מים), sense of *ab-undantia*, "abundance," a company of men or animals: it occurs, however, in 𝕿 (Pr. 3^{10} for ותירוש יקביך יפרצו, 5^{16} יפוצו מעינתיך חוצה), and is common in Syriac, *e.g.* for הֲלַפָּה, 16^{20}, and הֵשִׁיקוּ, Jl. 2^{24} 3^{18}, and of a river overflowing, Land. *Anecd. Syr.* iii. 244. 2, Wisd. 11^6 ܢܗܪܐ ܕܡܫܦܥ; see, further, PS. 4269 ff. Though the possibility of 𝕲 paraphrasing must be reckoned with, still in view of the uncertainty attaching to the use of עשק (*v. supr.*), יִשְׁפַּע is a very plausible emendation. [Gu. יִשְׁקַע—'שׁ, technical term for the falling of the Nile, Am. 9^5.]

יגיח] see on 38^8. Gr. הִגִּיעַ, *approaches to.*

ירדן] the emendation יְאֹר (Winckler, Be.) is unnecessary. [Che. in *EBi.* 2576 for יגיח ירדן reads יַעֲבֹר גִּיחוֹן. On rhythmical grounds we might rather omit ירדן, reducing the rhythm from 3 : 4 (21^{16} n.) to 3 : 3, a reduction also, but otherwise, obtained by Gu. (see on [24]).]

24. בעיניו] בעיני פ' is the Heb. idiom for *in the estimation, judgment, opinion of* (so even in Pr. 1^{17}): לעיני פ' (Dt. 4^6 and often) is idiom. for *in the sight* or *full view of*; and לעיני must be restored in 1 S. 21^{14}, Ezr. 3^{12}, and (if עיניו is correct) here, "Can one take him *before his eyes*" (= "when he is on the watch," RV.)? There is no *need* to change עיניו (which is

already expressed by Θ): still בְּצִנִּים, *with barbs* (cf. on 5^{5}) might be read—at least if the masc., and not the fem. (Am. 4^{2} צִנּוֹת), was in use for an artificial "thorn," or hook (spike, barb): Pr. 22^{5} צִנִּים פַּחִים בְּדֶרֶךְ עִקֵּשׁ is hardly decisive on the point.

בעיניו יקחנו וגו׳] 𝔊 (or rather Θ) *ἐν τῷ ὀφθαλμῷ αὐτοῦ δέξεται αὐτόν ; ἐνσκολιευόμενος τρήσει ῥῖνα ;* The question [if such was intended] must be indicated in 𝔐 by the tone of the voice: cf. Is. 28^{28a} (Del.), and G-K. 150*a*: the insertion (Bu.) of מי הוא (which might have fallen out after פיהו), *Who is he that* (13^{19} al.) *will* . . . ? would make the question more pointed and forcible [and remove the abnormal rhythm (2 : 3: see *Forms*, 176 ff.) of 𝔐]. [But it is, of course, quite uncertain whether a question was intended; and, since the whole of the rest of the section ($^{15-23}$) is descriptive and not interrogative, it is not, perhaps, very probable that it was, unless, as some have supposed, it is a misplaced distich of the following interrogative section on leviathan. It is likely enough that ^{24a} is defective; but if so what is missing may quite as well have given to the distich a negative, or a suitable positive, as an interrogative character. The present undue brevity of ^{24a} may be connected with the undue length of ^{23b}: so Gu. who ends ^{23} at the יר (taken as = כיאר) of ירדן, and sees in דן אל פיהו the corrupt beginning of ^{24} which, he suggests, described the capture of behemoth by *God* (אל). A not impossible alternative is that ^{24} consists of corrupt variants of or glosses on $^{25f.}$: note אף ^{24b}, אפו ^{26}: ינקב ^{24}, חקב ^{26}; במוקשים ^{24}, בחוח ^{26}; בעיניו יקחנו ^{24}, תמשך בחכה ^{25}. From 𝔊 the v. was absent.]

ינקב] contrast ^{26} תִּקֹּב. The נ in such cases is usually retained in pause (G-K. 66*f*), but see also Jer. 3^{5} יִנְטֹּר.

אף] rd. אַפּוֹ. For ^{24b} Klo., ingeniously redividing the words, כְּמוֹ קֹשׁ יָם יִנַק בְּאַפּוֹ; but not only is "suck" incongruous with both קש and באפו, but the thought does not harmonize with ^{24a}.

25. (EVV. 41^{1}) תמשך] the question will be indicated by the tone (see v.^{24} n.): Hi. Hfm. Bu. Gu. suppose הַאַף, a particle suggesting a question, to have dropped out after אפו. More probably הֲ itself has accidentally fallen out. [MS$^{Ken. 157}$

הַתְמשך.] In תמשך there is perhaps (Ew. Del. Bu. [but see Che. *Exp.*, July 1897; *EBi.* 520, n. 3]) an allusion to the Eg. word for the crocodile, *msuh* (emsuh), with the art. *p. emsah*; *χάμψαι* (Hdt. ii. 69) and Arab. *timsāḥ* seem to be inexact reproductions of the same word. As Bu. remarks, הֶעֱלָה is elsewhere the word used for drawing a fish out of the water (Hab. 1[15], Ezk. 29[4]). [But the use of משך with העלה in Gn. 37[28] (וימשכו ויעלו את־יוסף מן־הבור) and Jer. 38[13] (וימשכו את ירמיהו בחבלים ויעלו אתו מן הבור) suggests that משך may very well have been used naturally (without any play on *msuh*) of large animals, though we do not happen to have an instance of the usage in OT.]

חַכָּה] as Is. 19[8], Hab. 1[15] †.

תשקיע] Hrz. Del. press down its tongue *into* the line, so that it bites it, and thou art able to draw it up: but this is not probable. שקע, however, elsewhere of water *sinking* or subsiding, or of a stone *sinking* in it (Am. 9[5], Jer. 51[64]), is a somewhat strange word to use of *pressing down* the tongue: hence Be. תקשר, "canst thou *bind*?" but this also does not agree well with the angler's line. 𝔗 תקרח, *pierce*; *A* *συνδήσεις*; 𝔙 *ligabis*: [and so Mich. (see Ges. *Thes.* 1477) appealing to the Sam. חבש = שקע in Lv. 8[13]].

[לְשֹׁנוֹ] Hoffm. לְשִׁנָּיו, thus substituting teeth for (if the crocodile is referred to) the questionable tongue: but the cstr. so produced is awkward (see Bu.).]

26 (2). [ובחוח] cp. בַּחוֹחִים, 2 Ch. 33[11]; of a hook for holding captives חַח is more commonly used; see Is. 37[29], Ezk. 19[4] 29[4].]

27 (3). ידבר אליך רכות] Cf. the opposite in Gn. 42[7] וידבר אִתָּם קָשׁוֹת.

29 (5). ותקשרנו] [𝔊 + *ὥσπερ στρουθίον*, whence Gu. כצפור, Be. (better) כיונה: such an insertion would complete the rhythm to 3 : 3 if התשחק בו in [a] may be read with two stresses, otherwise 𝔐 is 2 : 2 and admits of no addition in [b]].

30 (6). יכרו עליו] see on 6[27].

חַבָּרִים] the form (cf. טַבָּח, etc.) suggests a more permanent association than חָבֵר, חֲבֵרִים. [The interrogation is carried on from [29] (cp. 39[2] (Di.): yet the omission of the ה between [26–29] and [31] is strange.]

31 (7). שְׂכֻּוֹת†] cf. שִׂכִּים, *thorns*, Nu. 33^{55} †.

צִלְצַל] see *Lex.* 852*b*.

32 (8). אַל־תּוֹסַף] we should expect וְאַל: "Think of the battle, and do it not again," by Heb. idiom = "If thou think . . . thou wilt not do it again"; like זֹאת עֲשׂוּ וִחְיוּ = "*if* you do this you will live": but וְ in such cases is sometimes omitted; so Pr. $3^{7f.}$ "*Be not* (אַל תְּהִי) wise in thine own eyes . . . רִפְאוּת תְּהִי לְשָׁרֶּךָ, *let it be* healing to thy navel," etc.,—in Engl. *and it will be*, etc. See Dr. § 152. 1, 2 (cases of an imper., followed by another imper. or a jussive, to express a hypothesis).

תּוֹסַף] in pause for תּוֹסֶף, as 19^{10} וָאֵלַךְ, Jg. 19^{20} (Hi.); cf. G-K. 29*q*, 69*v*.

CHAPTER XLI.

1–3 (9–11). The passage is difficult, and has given rise to many conjectures. We may consider these first. In [1b] Σ has *καταβαλεῖ* for יֻטָּל, which suggested יַטִּל, not (as Be.) to Houb. who has יוטל, but first, it seems, to Me. (p. 202), הנם אל־מַרְאַי יַטִּל (Will he even hurl—fight—against my appearing?); and so Wr. (Will he even hurl—fight—against them that shoot him? מֹרְאָיו, 2 S. 11[24]). For ואשלם [3a] 𝔊 has *καὶ ὑπομενεῖ* (in 9[4] also for וישלם), whence Me. וַיִּשְׁלָם, *and prosper, come off safe*; so Wr. (Hfm. וָאֲשַׁלְּמֵם and *I left him sound*). Gu. in 1895 (*Schöpfung u. Chaos*, p. 55 f.) went further, and supposing 40[32]–41[8] to be misplaced, and to have referred originally to behemoth, suggested for 41[1–3]:

חן תוחלתך נכזבה גם אֵל מַרְאָיו (מוֹרָאוֹ or) יָטִּיל:
(מלאך זר) כי יעירנו ומי הוא לפניו יתיצב:
מי הקדימו וַיִּשְׁלָם תחת כל השמים לא הוּא:

"Behold, *thy* self-confidence will be proved false,
His look (or, *his fear*) casts down even *a god*:
(An angel shrinks (scheut sich)) to stir him up,
And who is he that can stand before *him*?
Who ever confronted *him*, *and came off safe*?
Under the whole heaven, *not* one."

אל is vocalized אֵל by 𝔖 (אלהא). זר is presumably זָר, from זור, to *turn aside*: it does not commend itself; but מלאך זר is expressly put forward as only "eine sehr beschiedene Vermutung." For לא הוא = "not one," Gu. compares Jer. 5[12]; "he (*i.e.* such a one) is not!" would be the more exact rendering. In *JQR*, July 1897, p. 579, Che. improved this into

חן תוחלתך נכזבה גם אֵלִים מֹרָאוֹ יָטִּיל:
מלאך יִשְׁעַר כי יעוררנו ומי הוא לפניו יתיצב:
מי הקדימו וַיִּשְׁלָם תחת כל השמים לא אחד:

Surely thy self-confidence proves itself vain;
Even divine beings the fear of him lays low.
An angel shudders when he would arouse him;
Who then (among mortals) would dare to meet him as a foe?
Who ever confronted him and came off safe?
Under the whole heaven, not one! (*EBi.* i. 521).

𝔐 אל for אֵלִם by haplography. For שָׂעַר see Jer. 2[12]. לא אחר is certainly what would be expected to express "not one." Du. reads (including v.[4]):

חן תוחלתו נכזבה גם אל־מראיו יֻטָּל:
לא אכזר כי יעירנו ומי הוא לפניו יתיצב:
מי יקדמנו וישלם תחת כל השמים לא הוא:
לא יחדש בדיו ודבר גבורות והן ערכו:

In v.[1] Du. thus returns to 𝔐. V.[4] means, He (the assailant) would never again (after the conflict) renew his boastings (11^3), or his talk about valiant deeds, and his practical (?) outfit, הון being used in its Aram. sense of "Leichtigkeit, Bequemlichkeit, Reichlichkeit, daneben Vernünftigkeit," and הון ערכו, denoting his "praktische und comfortable Ausrüstung für die Expedition." But this sense of הון is more than questionable: הון in Aram. means really *mind*, *reason*, as דלא הונא (of an animal) *without reason*, מן הונה נפק, Mk. 3^{21}, went out of his *mind* (see many more exx. in PS. 992), and in 𝔗 (rare), Pr. 5^{19} teach *what is rational* at all times, 28^{16} 31^5: להוני להוני, Gn. 33^{14} 𝔗𝔍 (Levy, *ChWB* and *NHWB*, *s.v.*) cannot mean *literally* "at my ease," it must mean *according to my mind*, or *judgment*, *as I think fit*; it is thus a *paraphrase* of לְאִטִּי, not an exact rendering of it. The Arab. *hāna* is to *be light*, *easy*; but in actual use the Aram. הון shows no trace of this meaning: the development of meanings, conjectured by Fleischer (*ChWB*. i. 423; *NHWB*. i. 458 f.), if correct, must be prehistoric. Hi. Di. Del. adhere to 𝔐 in [1-8]; Bu. departs from it only in reading v.[1] תוחלתך, and תֻּטָּל for יטל, and v.[8] וַיִּשְׁלָם for ואשלם.

1 (9). If [1-8 (9-11)] is in its right place, in [1] the omission of הֲ is a sufficient change. 1 MS and 𝔖 have indeed "*thy* hope";

and Bu. and others (*v. supra*) adopt this, reading correspondingly in ᵇ "*thou* art prostrated" (תטל for יטל). No doubt this would be more pointed: the change, however, has but slight ancient support: besides, why after 40^{22} should the 2nd pers. have been altered into the 3rd? There are also cases in Heb. poetry of a pron. occurring with no antecedent expressed: *e.g.* Is. 13^{2} "lift up the hand to *them*," *i.e.* to the foes of whom the poet is thinking.

נכזבה] The verb is the one commonly rendered to *lie* (*e.g.* 6^{28}), cf. Pr. 30^{6} (Nif. as here). "And thus *be proved a liar*": but it is also used more generally, as Ps. 116^{11} "All men are *liars*," *i.e.* are a deceptive help, Is. 58^{11} "a spring of water, whose waters *lie* not," *i.e.* do not play false (EVV. *fail not*; but the Heb. expresses more than merely *come to an end*).

יטל] a strong word, lit. *flung down*: cp. Ps. 37^{24} "though he fall, he will not *be prostrated*."

2 (10). אכזר is not *bold* or *daring* (Di. al.), but *cruel* (30^{21}, La. 4^{3}, Jer. 6^{23}); it is doubtful whether it ought to be weakened even to *fierce*. It thus suits the animal, rather than its assailant. לא אכזר, also, for "*there is not* a daring (cruel) one" (for אין אכזר) is very strange Heb., such passages as 22^{16}, Is. 44^{19} being not really parallel. If אכזר were referred to the animal, though אכזר הוא would be the normal expression, the הוא might just be omitted, as Ps. 16^{8} (כי מימיני); but we must in this case either (Gr.) omit לא, as dittographed from יטל אכזר, or as the duplication of *both* ל and א is not very likely, read הֲלֹא: *Is he not* (or *He is*) cruel that one should stir him up? Gie. suggests אֲבָרֵךְ יעירנו, "I *will not bless* (praise as happy) him that stirreth him up"; but the expression does not seem a natural one.

יעורנו] so Occ., and Or. Qrê; but rd. either יְעִירנו (Or. Ktib.), or, better, as rather a stronger word, יְעוֹרְרֶנּוּ (3^{8}, Zec. 9^{18}).

3a (11a). 𝔊 ἢ τίς ἀντιστήσεταί μοι καὶ ὑπομενεῖ; strictly = מִי יְקַדְּמֵנִי (or יְקַדְּמֵנִי) וִישַׁלֵּם, but the tenses need not be pressed.

4 (12). [The rhythm (2 : 2 : 2 : see 17^{1} n.) as well as other features of the v. (see the following notes) are suspicious; and the v. may have suffered serious corruption and originally have

meant something quite different from what it is commonly supposed to mean.]

אחריש] only here construed with an acc. in the sense of "keep silence *about*." [Me. *silently tolerate*, strains the meaning of the word even more: Du. יַחֲרִשׁ: see next n.]

בדיו] [*his limbs*—a meaning fairly secured by 18[13] in spite of the corruption of that v.—must be the meaning of the word, if the v. is in its right position and rightly read in 𝕳: Me. Du. give the word the meaning it has in 11[3] (see n. there): Me., I (God) will not silently endure *his* (Job's) *idle talk*: Du., He (viz. who had once attempted to assail behemoth) would never (thereafter) renew *his boastings*; see above on [1-3]].

דבר] either *word* = *account*; or *matter* (*Lex.* 183*b*, 3), as דבר אוריה, 1 K. 15[5]; דברי האתנות (rd. with 𝕲 דְּבַר) 1 S. 10[2]: cf. 1 K. 6[38] לכל דבריו = "in all its *particulars*."

גבורות] rd. גְּבוּרָתוֹ: the sf. is needed.

חין] as it stands, a very questionable by-form of חֵן (√ חָנַן) *gracefulness*, which, however, is not here a suitable sense. Rd. probably חֵיל (Honth. Be.).

ערכו] עֵרֶךְ is an *arrangement*, or something *arranged*, as Jg. 17[10] ערך בגדים, an *arrangement* (= *suit*) of raiment, properly the separate pieces *laid out* in order; Ex. 40[23] ויערך עליו ערך לחם, arranged upon it an *arrangement* of bread. Here of the *arrangement* or *disposition* of the animal's parts = structure.

5 (13). פני לבושו] a peculiar use of פני (found also in Is. 25[7] פני הלוט, the face of the veil) in which ל is the genitive of the "substratum" (Hi.), or the "explicative" genitive (G–K. 128*k*): the face, or front, or surface, *consisting in* his garment = *his outward garment*, the garment being the animal's scales.

רסנו] 𝕲 θώρακος αὐτοῦ; rd. סִרְיֹנוֹ. LXX

6 (14). פניו] 𝕾 Bu. פִּיו. But (Du.) the doors of the face *are* the mouth.

7 (15). גאוה] 𝕲 τὰ ἔγκατα αὐτοῦ, 'Α σῶμα αὐτοῦ, 𝔙 corpus illius. These renderings point to גֵּוֹה = גֵּוֹ, *his back*, which also suits admirably: so Houb. Boch. Mich. Di. Bi. Bu. Du. al.

סָגוּר חוֹתָם צָר] צָר is *compressed, tight, narrow*, 2 K. 6[1] צַר מִמֶּנּוּ . . . הַמָּקוֹם, Is 59[19] נָהָר צָר: so חוֹתָם צָר is a (clay) seal *closely pressed down* (*v.s.*). סָגוּר will be construed syntactically with גֵּוֹ; but the implicit reference will be to the individual scales of which the back consists. EVV. "Shut up as *by* a close or tight seal" (*i.e.* a closely adhering seal, Del.), implies both a doubtful sense for צָר, and a hard construction of the accus., חוֹתָם צָר, going beyond the cases mentioned in G–K. 118*q*, or even 117 ff. at the end. The first difficulty would be removed by reading (Me. Hfm. Bu.) חוֹתָם צֹר, a seal of *flint* (Jos. 5[2. 3], Ezk. 3[9] חָזָק מִצֹּר; cf. 𝕲 σύνδεσμος αὐτοῦ ὥσπερ σμιρίτης λίθος, *like emery-stone*), *i.e.* a *hard* seal, pressing down the clay firmly; but the second difficulty would remain. Bi.[1] Du. Be. read סְגֹרוֹ חוֹתָם צֹר, "His (so 𝕲) *breast* is a seal of flint": but it is doubtful if "breast" is the meaning of סְגוֹר (Hos. 13[8] † אֶקְרַע סְגוֹר לִבָּם); [moreover, so emended, [7b] (sing.) awkwardly separates [8f.] from the *plural* מגנים in [7a] to which [8f.] in 𝕳 refers (𝕲 om. [8a. 9] and has the sing. in [8b]). However, [7b] in 𝕸 is certainly awkward too, and may be considered doubtful].

8 (16a). [𝕲 omits this line.]

יִגַּשׁוּ] [Kön. ii. 540: cp. the pausal form, הֻגָּשׁוּ, 2 S. 3[34]].

[רוּחַ] masc. as 20[3] (n.). Be. רֶוַח (Gn. 32[17]), which scarcely suits יבא so well.]

9 (17). The v. is absent from MS[Ken. 84] and 𝕲, and is omitted by Me. Bi. Du. as a doublet of [8]. But the poet himself may have desired to dwell upon the thought which the words express (cf. [11-13]).

אחיהו] so for אָחִיו, Mic. 7[2], Jer. 34[9], 2 Ch. 31[12] †.

10. עטישתיו †] The verb is not found in OT. any more than it is in Aram. and Eth. (though the *subst.* is found in both [; and the vb. occurs in NH. and Arabic]). 𝕿 זְרִירוֹהִי (cf. זֵרֵר Poʿ., 2 K. 4[35] †).

תָּהֶל] the fem. sg. by G–K. 145*k*; but Sgf. Bi.[2] Bu. Du. Be. עֲטִישָׁתוֹ: cf. 𝕲 ἐν πταρμῷ αὐτοῦ.

11 (19). יהלכו] Probably felt to suggest greater rapidity of movement than ילכו: cf. 23[8] (n.).

כידודי] only here. [Probably (Barth, *NB* 142) a noun of the same form as ניחוח, from √כיד; كاد (med. ى) is used of a fire-stick emitting *sparks*; from the same root may come כדכד, the name of a precious stone as something that *sparkles*. The √כדד from which כידד is alternatively derived (Lagarde, *BN* 182) does not explain the meaning required here by the gen. אש and the ‖ לפידים.]

יתמלטו] The √ idea seems to be to *slip away*; hence in Nif. (oft.) to *escape*: in Pi. and Hif. to *let* (an egg, or child) *slip away* (from the womb), so only Is. 34[15] 66[7]: here, of sparks, to *slip forth* = *stream* or *leap forth*. 𝕾 דמתלהטין, 𝔙 *accensæ*, as though reading התלהטו.

12 (20). דוד נפוח] a pot *blown upon* = well-heated, or, as we should say, *boiling*: cf. סִיר נָפוּחַ, Jer. 1[13]; also, for the vb., Ezk. 22[20] לָפַחַת עליו אש.

ואגמן] [if this is rightly read and means as in 40[26] a *reed*, it must be explained as above. But a reference to the fuel seems superfluous. Saad. gave אגמן the meaning of *caldron*; so Seb. Münster, AV.; but the meaning is not established, and the mention of a second utensil improbable. The vb. اجم means *to be hot* (of the day), *to burn up* (of fire), and the noun اجم is the *ardour* (of anger); hence אגמן itself has been taken by some in the sense of *boiling*: but if this be the meaning, it is preferable to read אגם (Bi.), the ן being a dittograph. 𝔙 sicut ollæ succensæ atque ferventis: 𝕿 היך דודא נפיח דעבד כיפא; 𝕾 ܐܝܟ ܩܕܪܐ ܕܡܚܡܐ ܘܡܪܬܚܐ].

13 (21). נפשו] נפש = *breath*, only here, and (as generally understood) בָּתֵּי נֶפֶשׁ = "*scent*-boxes," Is. 3[20] [but see n. there]. נְשָׁמָה is more usually *breath*, and *spirit* only Pr. 20[27]. In Arab. *nafas* = "breath," *nafs* = "soul." Cf. the Nif. *take breath* = refresh oneself (so Syr., Pa. to *refresh*, Ethp. to *be refreshed*).

גחלים] 2 MSS of 𝕲 prefix ὡς; and so Sgf. Bu. Du. Be. כגחלים. The change is unnecessary: of course, even with גחלים the poet did not think of literal "coals," any more than he thought of a literal "flame" in [b].

14 (22). תָּדוּץ] דוץ in Heb. only here: in Aram. to *dance*

(= σκιρτᾶν, in 𝕾 Lk. $1^{41.44}$ 6^{23}, Ps. $114^{4.6}$ Hex.; often also in the more general sense of *exult*, *rejoice*, as 2 S. 1^{20} 𝕾𝕿, Is. 54^{1} 𝕾). 𝕲 τρέχει = תָּרוּץ, preferred by Be. here; but "dancing" is a far more poetical idea than "running."

[דְּאָבָה] the subst. only here: the vb. means to *melt* or *waste away*, especially of the נפש, Ps. 88^{10} עֵינִי דָאֲבָה מִנִּי עֹנִי, Jer. 31^{12} והיתה נפשם כְּגַן רָוֶה ולא יוסיפו לְדַאֲבָה עוד, ^{25} כי הִרְוֵיתִי נפש עֲיֵפָה וכל נפש דָּאֲבָה מִלֵּאתִי †; so דְּאָבוֹן, Dt. 28^{65} † כִּלְיוֹן עינים וְדַאֲבוֹן נפש, and דוב, Lv. 26^{16} diseases מְכַלּוֹת עינים וּמְדִיבֹת נפש †, 1 S. 2^{33} לְכַלּוֹת את עיניך וְלַאֲדִיב (rd. וּלְהָדִיב) את נפשך †. Probably in Heb. the √ is everywhere an Aramaism: for the Syr. ܕܳܒ (PS. 830 f.) corresponds in meaning to the Heb. זוב, to *flow* (= Arab. ذاب), though it occurs also in the fig. sense of *tabescere* (*e.g.* through grief; *v.* PS.), very much like the Heb. דָּאַב, דוב (which are found *only* in the fig. sense). Cf. τήκομαι, used often in similar applications. Here דְּאָבָה will be a fig. for the failure of nerve and courage (cf. נָמוֹג), occasioned by the approach of the monster, hence *despair* or *dismay*. 𝕾 רחלתא, *fear*, 𝕿 דאבונא, 'Α ἐκλιμίαν, whence no doubt 𝖁 *egestas*. 𝕲 ἀπώλεια = אֲבַדּוֹן in 26^{6} 28^{22}, Ps. 88^{12}, Pr. 15^{11} 27^{20} (אֲבַדֹּה), which is hence adopted strangely by Be. as the original reading here. But אֲבַדּוֹן is in OT. (*v.* on 26^{6}) exclusively used of the *place* [ct. Rev. 9^{11}] of destruction, Sheol: hence, with תָּרוּץ (see the last note) we have the extraordinary picture of Sheol running before the crocodile.

15 (23). [מַפְּלֵי] elsewhere only Am. 8^{6} מַפַּל בַּר, of what *falls* as refuse from wheat.

[דָּבֵקוּ] 𝕲 κεκόλληνται (cf. ^{9} προσκολληθήσεται for יְדֻבָּקוּ), 𝕿 מִתְאַדְּקִין (cf. v.^{9}, Dt. 28^{60} 𝕵), whence Du. Be. דֻּבָּקוּ (as ^{9} 38^{38}). The change, however, is not necessary; nor are 𝕲𝕿 any evidence that the pass. was read by them. The trans. κολλάω *could* not be used for the intrans. דָּבֵק; and the Pual in Dt. 28^{60} would be very unnatural.

[יָצוּק] *poured out*, i.e. *cast*; and so *firm*: see on 11^{15}. The sg. יָצוּק may refer to בְּשָׂרוֹ, or to מפלי ב' regarded as a single mass, *as something firm*, etc. (Kö. 411 *i*). The threefold יָצוּק (in $^{15b.\ 16a.\ b}$) is not an elegance. ^{15b} 𝕲 om. (v. Field). Bi.^{2} Du.

Be. omit ^{15b}, and in ^{16} the words יצוק כמו אבן ו׳, as a gloss on ^{16b}, reducing $^{15-16}$ thus to מפלי בשרו דבקו לבו יצוק כפלח תחתית [but this produces the questionable rhythm 3 : 4 (21^{16} n.): ^{16} might quite well stand with a synonym substituted in ^{b} for יצוק (cp. 8^{8} n.); יצוק in ^{15b} may well be corrupt].

בל ימוט] Both בַּל and ימוט only here in Job; but בַּל יִמּוֹט (אֶמּוֹט, תִּמּוֹט) is a standing combination,—often attached to another vb. as a circ. cl. (Ps. 10^{6} 16^{8} 30^{7} 21^{8} 46^{6} $93^{1} = 96^{10} =$ 1 Ch. 16^{30} 104^{5}, Pr. 10^{30} 12^{3} †: with לא, Ps. 15^{5} $62^{3.7}$ 112^{6} 125^{1}, Is. 40^{20} 41^{7} †); so it hardly tells against the genuineness of the line.

17 (23). מִשֵּׂתוֹ] for מִשְּׂאֵתוֹ (G–K. 23*f*), the vb. being intrans., as [(if the text is right) in Hos. 13^{1}, Nah. 1^{5}, Ps. 89^{10}, Hab. 1^{3}. Ehrlich מִשְּׁתוֹ (with גלים for אלים and משברי ים for משברים), *at his hinder part*; but whether שת, *the seat* or *buttocks* in men, denoted the hinder part of an animal is questionable].

אֵלִים] = אֵילִים, Ex. 15^{15} אילי מואב, Ezk. 17^{13} אילי הארץ, 31^{11} אֵל גוים, 32^{21} גבורים (MSS אילי) אֵלֵי, 2 K. 24^{15} Qrê ואת אילי הארץ (*Lex.* 18*a*, 42*a*?).

שברים] usually explained as an abstract plural (G–K. 124*d*, *f*) = *state of brokenness*, viz. of mind = *consternation*: cf. שֵׁבֶר רוח, Is. 65^{14}; שֶׁבֶר ברוח, Pr. 15^{4}; תְּבִירוּת רוחא, Qoh. 1^{14} 𝔗. But the omission of רוח makes this explanation questionable. [Moreover, the rhythm of 𝔐 is 3 : 2 (17^{14} n.); the rhythm may have been normal and משברים may be a corruption of *two* words: for suggested emendations, see next n.]

יתחטאו] The primary meaning of חטא is to *miss* (see on 5^{24}): in Eth. (Di. *Lex.* 619*f*) it regularly means to *be without* (*e.g.* = οὐκ ἔσχον, Dn. 10^{16}); and in III. (the reflexive conj.) it means (Di.) *se subducere*, and so (*a*) *evanescere*; (*b*) *aufugere*, as 1 S. 19^{18} and often; (*c*) *abesse*, *deesse*, *deficere*. Hence it is explained here by Schult. Ges. *lose their way* ("præ tenore *a via aberrant*"); by Hi. *fall into confusion*, "*treten gegenseitig fehl*, so that they stumble one over another," and by Di. Del., in a fig. sense, *miss* (5^{24}) or *lose themselves* mentally (= RV. *are beside themselves*; Bu. Du. *get confused*). Gu. (p. 55), מִשְּׂאֵתוֹ (p. 33) אלים יגורו בשמי מָרוֹם יִתְחַבָּאוּ, At his raging (cf.

Ps. 89[10], reading בִּשְׂאֹת = בְּשׂוֹא) the gods are in dread, They hide themselves in the lofty heaven. But this stands or falls with the mythological interpretation of לויתן: שׁוֹאָה also never actually means *raging* (*Tosen*). Bu. (after Buhl), keeping [a] as it is, reads in [b] מִשְׁבְּרֵי יָם יתחטאו, "the billows of the sea get out of tune" (kommen aus der Takt): but the "billows of the sea," even though "sea" be taken to denote the tide, are out of place, and "get out of tune" or "confused" (geraten in Verwirrung) is a strange idea to apply to them. 𝔖 ܘܡܠܟܐ ܕܩܝܡܝܢ, those that are *firm*, *secure* (ܡܠܟܐ = יצוק in [15]), and 𝔙 *territi* (? מְשֻׁבָּרִים) find in משברים a ‖ to אלים (𝔊 gives no help here: 𝔗 מן תבריא = 𝔐). Du. וּמִשְׁמָרִים for ומשברים: When the monster "lifts itself up, the leaders are in dread, and *the guards* (of the Nile, military, or customs', officers on the S. frontier) fall into confusion": but the pl. of מִשְׁמָר, *body of keepers*, *guard* (Jer. 51[12]), is elsewhere always משמרות (mostly Chr. Neh.). Gie. Be. read for ומשברים, וּמִשִּׁ[נָּיו גִּ]בֹּרִים, "and *at his teeth mighty men* (are beside themselves": or, Be., יֵחַתּוּ *are dismayed*). This is the best suggestion that has been made; though, as a parallel to מִשֵּׂתוֹ something less special than "teeth" is rather expected.

18 (26). מַשִּׂיגֵהוּ] The ptcp. absolute would be just possible, "When one approacheth him with the sword, it holdeth not" (2 S. 23[8], Pr. 28[27a] נֹתֵן לָרָשׁ אין מחסור: G–K. 116*w*; Dr. 121, *Obs.* 1 *n.*, and 135. 6 *n.*: and חרב, as חֲרָם, Mic. 7[2]; G–K. 117*ff*, *end*): but the construction is forced, while the change to תשיגנו is slight, and with it all awkwardness disappears. So MS[Ken.] 180, Gră. Be.; cf. 𝔗 ידביקיניה חרבא, 𝔙 Cum apprehenderit eum gladius. Bu. מִמְּגִנָּיו "on account of its *shields* (scales)"; cf. v.[7]

בלי תקום] [בלי, though otherwise construed it is comparatively frequent in Job (see *Lex.*), is here only used to negative a finite vb.: in this Di. detects a linguistic difference of 40[15]–41[26]: but the use of בלי with a finite vb. is exceedingly rare elsewhere also (Gn. 31[20] (E), Is. 14[6] 32[10], Hos. 8[7] 9[16] Kt. †), and it is no more remarkable that it occurs only once in Job than that it occurs only once in E].

18b. Absent from 𝔊; added from Θ.

מַסָּע] only here. Perhaps from نسغ, to *strike* or *hit* (among other meanings).

שִׁרְיָה] also only here. If correct, = Arab. *sirwat^un*, a *small, short arrow*, or (a dialect-variant of *sirwat^un*) *siryat^un*, an *arrow-head* (Lane, 1354^a, 1356^a). Hfm. Bu. (alt.) Du. (alt.) שְׁדִיָּה = Syr. ܡܫܕܝܐ = βολίς, *javelin* (PS. 4065), from שְׁדִי common in Aram. in the sense of *to throw* (*e.g.* arrows, 1 S. 20[20] 𝔖𝔗). Θ (θώρακα) 𝔗𝔙 confuse with שִׁרְיוֹן; but a weapon of *offence* is required by the context.

19 (27)b. רִקָּבוֹן†] on the form, Kö. ii. p. 129. Bu. רָקָב, as Pr. 12[4] al., supposing the ן dittographed from נחושה.

20 (28)b. לוֹ] are turned (or turn themselves) *for* him into stubble: cf. 30[21], Is. 63[10] וַיֵּהָפֵךְ לָהֶם לְאוֹיֵב (*Lex.* 512*b*).

21 (29)a. absent from 𝔊: Θ ὡς καλάμη ἐλογίσθησαν σφυρά (*rd.* σφῦραι: v. Field). Σ^H ὡς καλάμη ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ σφῦρα, 𝔙 Quasi stipulam æstimabit malleum. כקש after [20b] לקש is weak: ΣΘ Be. כְּקָנֶה is very probable. For נחשבו (miswritten, after [20b] נהפכו), rd. with Σ^H Di. Be. Bu. Du. נֶחְשַׁב לוֹ, or at least נֶחְשַׁב: to treat תותח as a collective is forced. The ל as Is. 40[17] *al.* (*Lex.* 514*a*).

תּוֹתָח†] Cf. Arab. *watakha*, to beat with a club: *mîtakhat^un*, a *club*. [Or תותח may be a loan-word from Ass. *tartaḫ*, *a* (*light*) *javelin* (Del. *HWB* 630).]

22 (30). חדודי חרש] G–K. 133*h*. [𝔐 = *the sharpest pot-sherds*; but pointing חָרָשׁ we might render *the sharpest* (instruments) of (*i.e.* forged by) *the smith*; but the parallel in Ælian cited above favours 𝔐.]

יִרְפַּד] Rd. יְרַפֵּד: cf. 17[13] בַּחֹשֶׁךְ רִפַּדְתִּי יְצוּעָי. In Ass. (Del. *HWB* 625) *rapâdu* is to *stretch oneself* out on the ground (of a person or animal): in Arab. (Lane, 1119) *rafada* is to *aid*, *help*, or *assist*, with a gift or other things, to *prop up* or *support* (a wall); *rifd* is a *gift* or *gratuity*: *râfidat^un* is *rafters*, *beams* ("apparently, as a thing that *aids* or *assists*," Lane); and *rifâdat^un* is a *pad* or *stuffed thing*, beneath a saddle, a *support* for the saddle: cf. in Heb. Ca. 2[5] סַמְּכוּנִי בָּאֲשִׁישׁוֹת רַפְּדוּנִי בַּתַּפּוּחִים; 3[10] רְפִידָה, appar. a *support* (*i.e.* a back or arm) in a palanquin

(𝔊 *ἀνάκλιτον*). רפד here and 17^{13} must clearly be a distinct √ from the √ of Ca. 2^5 3^{10}; and (unless we should read each time רָבַד, Pr. 7^{16}† + 1 S. 9^{25} 𝔊; cf. מַרְבַדִּים, Pr. 7^{16} 31^{22}†) must be explained from the Ass. *rapâdu*, to *stretch oneself*: as this is intrans. it is better to read here the *Piel* (as in 17^{13}). Du., arguing that [22] is ‖ [21], and that consequently it should mention some weapons which the monster counts as nothing, would read הֵחַת חרודי חָרָשׁ דָּרְבָן חָרִיץ עָלָיו (= 𝔊 *ὑπ' αὐτόν*) טִיט "He shatters the sharp edges of the smith, Goad (and) pickaxe (?; 2 S. 12^{31}) against him are (as) mud,"—if a peasant tries to rescue from him a child or an animal, the weapons at his disposal are useless [but this gives the improbable rhythm 3:4: 21^{16} n].

24 (32). יאיר] may be either trans. or (Ezk. 43^2, Ps. 139^{12}) intrans.: נְתִיבוֹ (Bi.[2] Gu. Bu.) is unnecessary.

יחשב] *sc.* הַחֹשֵׁב (G–K. 144*d*, *e*) = Engl. "one." The punctuation יַחְשֹׁב is needless and not an improvement. 𝔊 contracted the v. into *τὸν δὲ τάρταρον τῆς ἀβύσσου ὥσπερ αἰχμάλωτον* (governed by *ἥγηται* in [23b]), *i.e.* תהום (?) אַחֲרֵי לִשְׁבִיָּה (*τάρτ.* elsewhere in 𝔊 only 40^{15} (Heb. [20]) *ἐπελθὼν δὲ ἐπ' ὄρος ἀκρότομον ἐποίησεν χαρμονὴν τετράποσιν ἐν τῷ ταρτάρῳ*, a strange rendering of כי יבול הרים ישאו לו וכל חַיַּת השדה ישחקו שם, and Pr. 24^{51} (= Heb. 30^{16}), where it seems to be a misplaced doublet for שְׁאֹל): Origen, not perceiving that this represented the whole verse, supplied from Θ (see Field) what in Swete's text stands as [23b] *ἐλογίσατο ἄβυσσον εἰς περίπατον*. Gu., partly after 𝔊, would read אחרית יָאוֹר נְתִיבֹ[וֹ] יחשב תהום לִשְׁבִיָּה, "the bottom (? ? ?) of the stream is his path, the ocean he counteth as booty"—supposing the v. to refer to Leviathan's rule over the under-world; Du. יאיר נְתִיב חשך אחריו תהום לְשָׁבִיב, "He maketh a path to shine in the darkness (the dark waters). Behind him the deep becometh a flame." 𝔖, omitting [22–24a], expresses in [24b] יחשב תהום לְיַבָּשָׁה; 𝔙𝔗 = 𝔐.

25 (33). עפר] poet. for *the earth*; 19^{25} n.

מָשְׁלוֹ†] 𝔊 *ὅμοιον αὐτῷ*; so most: in Arab. *mithluhu*. Me. Sgf. Gu. Bu. Du. Be. would point מִשְׁלוֹ; but מֹשֶׁל never actually occurs in the sense of *likeness*. מֹשְׁלוֹ, *his ruler*, would

also be possible: so Hi. Reuss, Hfm.; Di. does not seem to decide between this and *like*.

העשר] rd. הֶעָשׂוּי (cf. 15^{22} n.).

לבלי־חת] cf. Gn. 9^2 חִתְּכֶם†, 35^5 חִתָּה†, c. 6^{21} חֲתַת†. לִבְלִי (as 38^{41} יְתְעוּ לִבְלִי אֹכֶל, see *n.*, Is. 5^{14} (of Sheol) פָּעֲרָה פִיהָ לִבְלִי חֹק) = *in a state of* no fear = *without fear*. Gu. לבעל תחת, "to be lord of the under-world (? ?)"; Che. לבעל תחתיות, which is at least Hebrew; Gie. ("if a change is desired") לְבַעַל חַיּוֹת, which might be right.

26a. Rd., with Gu. Bu. Du. Be., אֹתוֹ כָּל־גָּבֹהַּ יִרָא.

שחץ] [𝔊 τῶν ἐν τοῖς ὕδασιν, 𝔖 ܢܘܢܐ (both without expressing any equivalent for בני), 𝔗 בני כורי: whence שרץ has been precariously conjectured instead of שחץ].

CHAPTER XLII.

2. ידעת] Kt. ידעתָּ: Qrê ידעתי. For the 1st pers. written without ', see G-K. 44*i*. Me. curiously adopts the 2nd pers.

ולא יבצר ממך מזמה] cp., with a longer prose equivalent of מזמה, Gn. 11[6] לא יבצר מהם כל אשר יזמו לעשות: for מזמה of God's plans see Jer. 23[20]. Emendation of מזמה to מאומה (Be.) or מה (Bi.), or of כי כל תוכל ולא to כי יָכָלְתָּ וכל לא (Du., who omits מזמה: cp. מי זה מ' at the beginning of v.[3]), are unnecessary (though Du.'s יכלת no doubt gives a good antithesis to קלתי, 40[4]), and 𝔊's *οὐθέν* cannot be cited in support; for having paraphrased ולא יבצר ממך by *ἀδυνατεῖ δέ σοι* the translator necessarily also paraphrased מזמה by *οὐθέν*.

3. מי זה . . . דעת] 𝔊[א*] om.; = 38[2a].

מעלים] MS[Ken. 248] מחשיך, as 38[2].

בלי דעת] read with MS[Ken. 100] 𝔖 במלין בלי דעת, as 38[2]: note also *ῥημάτων* in 𝔊's paraphrase.

לכן הגדתי] 𝔊 *τίς δὲ ἀναγγελεῖ μοι;* 𝔖 ܡܠܠܬ ܒܠܐ ܡܕܥ.
Between הגדתי and ולא the loss of גדלת (|| נפלאות, as 5[9]) would have been easy; yet its insertion would overload the line. 𝔊's *μεγάλα after* ולא אבין is not in the position in which גדלת, if it had been used, would have stood. Hoffm. seeks an obj. to הגדתי in לכן read as לא כן; but this gives a questionable position to the object and a bad parallel to נפלאות.

ולא אבין . . . ולא אדע] G-K. 156*f*.

5. שמעתיך] שמע, to hear *of*, receive a report about, as Ex. 18[1], 2 K. 19[11]: cp. with the same antithesis to ראה, Ps. 48[9] כאשר שמענו כן ראינו.

6. The v. seems to be defective: אמאס and ונחמתי, as parallel terms, should stand in different lines: but, if divided at אמאס, the very questionable 2 : 3 rhythm (40[24] n.) is the

result. Bu. completes [a] by inserting אשר דברתי after אמאס: Böttcher, Be. (Che. *EBi.* 2481) by reading הִמֵּס אֶמַּס for אמאס.

אמאס] if correctly read, an obj. has dropped out (see last n.), or must be understood (cp. 7^{16}): MS[Ken. 601] supplies חַיַּי (cp. 9^{21}). The understood object has been taken to be *myself*, or, better, *what I have said and done* (Di.): but neither is very satisfactory; and if this is the sense, it is better to restore a suitable object by emendation; see last n.

ונחמתי על עפר ואפר] both נחם and על are ambiguous: and עפר ואפר have also been very differently taken. נִחַם על means *to be sorry for, to repent of* (so, *e.g.*, Jer. 8^{6} and frequently), and also *to comfort oneself for* (so 2 S. 13^{39}, Jer. 31^{15}); but it is difficult to find a suitable sense for עפר ואפר as the obj. of this verbal phrase, though attempts have been made: so 𝕿 ואתנחמית מבני דהנן עפרא וקטם; Ehrlich, I repent of my empty and foolish speeches. Consequently most take the vb. absolutely (it is frequently so used in both senses, *to be sorry*, *e.g.* Ex. 13^{17}, and *to comfort oneself*, *e.g.* Gn. 38^{12}): I repent (while sitting) upon dust and ashes, or I comfort myself (though sitting) upon dust and ashes (Che., reading וְנָמַקֹּתִי for ונחמתי and in [a] המס אמס): therefore I must pine away, and dissolve to dust and ashes (*EBi.* 2481), but על would hardly be the right preposition even if נמקתי might be accepted. 𝕲 *ἥγημαι δὲ ἐγὼ ἐμαυτὸν γῆν καὶ σποδόν*: but it is doubtful whether this is anything but a paraphrase of 𝕳.

7. אחר] followed by the pf. in 𝕸 (דִּבֶּר) is = אחר אשר: see 19^{26} n.

אלי] for עָלַי, as, *e.g.*, 1 S. 3^{12}, 1 K. 16^{12}: cp. *Lex.* 41*a*, 181*b*, 3b end: 𝕲 wrongly *ἐνώπιόν μου*; so 𝕾𝖁: 𝕿 לותי and so Bu. *zu mir*, which he defends on the ground that "all human speech has God for its hearer, and is directed towards Him"!

כעבדי] many MSS בעבדי: and so in v.[8] where 𝕲 (*κατά*, here *ὥσπερ*) implies the same reading.

8. והעליתם] 𝕲 *ποιήσει*, 𝕾 ܢܣܩ, making Job's activity begin with the offering instead of (𝕳) with the prayer; the expression of the subj. before יתפלל vouches for the correctness of 𝕳.

כי אם פניו אשא] unless אם is an error for את (Du.), כי אם either = *only* (cp., if rightly read, Gn. 40^{14}, Nu. 24^{22}), or *surely* (cp. Jg. 15^{7}, 1 S. 21^{6}): *Lex.* 475*a*, b and c.

אלי . . . כעבדי] see on v.[7].

9. צפר] read with many MSS and VV. וצפר.

10. שב את־שבית איוב] Qrê שבות. This is the only occurrence of the phrase שב שבות (השב) with the name of an *individual* in the gen. after שבות; the gen. is generally the name of a people, occasionally that of a country (Jer. 33^{11}). The exceptional usage here would have to be explained as due to loss of the real sense of the phrase, if it originally meant *to bring back the captives of*, and was composed of a vb. from the root שוב and a noun from the root שבה. But since Ew. (on Jer. 48^{47} and in *Jahrb. Bibl. Wiss.* v. 216 f.) the view has generally prevailed that the vb. and noun are from the same root (Ew. appeals to Ps. 126^{1}, which would be decisive if שיבת is rightly read there), and the phrase of the same character as ריב ריב פ׳, נקם נְקם פ׳; the meaning in this case is *to turn the turning*, *i.e.* to change the fortunes of, and the phrase as suitable in reference to an individual as to a nation. The phrase occurs chiefly in the prophetic literature (Jer. Ezk. Zeph. and the probably late vv. Hos. 6^{11}, Am. 9^{14}), but also in Ps. 14^{7} = 53^{7} 85^{2} 126^{1} (read שבית), La. 2^{14}. It is not impossible that in some of these passages the author himself thought of captivity in connection with שבות; this sense was in any case quite early read into the form (cp. 𝔊 *αἰχμαλωσία* frequently), and is probably the reason of שבית in 𝔐 interchanging with שבות, and of the punctuation שְׁבוּת (yet cp. לָזוּת from לוז) instead of שְׁבוּת.

רעהו] not sing. (Di. Bu.: for 12^{4} 16^{21} are not analogous), even with a collective sense (G–K. 91*k*), but, as in 1 S. 30^{26}, pl. (𝔊𝔖𝔗𝔙) = רעיהו, unless we emend to רעיו (Du.), the form used elsewhere.

11. ויאכלו עמו לחם בביתו] Be. ויאכלו וישתו עמו after 𝔊, and noting that MS[Ken. 76] reads וישתו for בביתו and two MSS omit בביתו. But the addition of the detail (cp. the variants as between 𝔐 and 𝔊 in 1 S. 1^{9}, 2 S. 12^{21}) is more probable than its omission.

13. שבענה] probably an error for שִׁבְעָה: G-K. 97*c*.

14. יְמִימָה] if = يمامة, *dove*, read יוֹמָה (so Be. "frt"): if a diminutive (Hitz.) = يميمة, point יְמֵימָה.

15. נמצא נשים] G-K. 121*a*; cp. 145*o* (footnote). 2 MSS[Ken.] Be. נמצאו.

להם . . . אביהם אחיהם] G-K. 135*o*.

16. ויִרא] Ktib. וַיִּרְא: Qrê וַיִּרְאֶה; G-K. 75*t*.

INDEXES.

I ENGLISH.

The *italicized* figures refer to the pages of the Philological Notes in volume II. All other figures refer to volume I.

II. HEBREW.

The *italicised* figures refer to the pages of the Philological Notes.

Forms and meanings marked with an asterisk are in the Hebrew of the OT. peculiar to the book of Job; several of these, as pointed out in the notes, rest merely on punctuation or are due to textual corruption.

Words enclosed in brackets do not occur in 𝔐 of Job, but rest on a different punctuation or emendations of the text, not in all cases adopted in the notes and translation.

The International Critical Commentary

ARRANGEMENT OF VOLUMES AND AUTHORS

THE OLD TESTAMENT

GENESIS. The Rev. John Skinner, D.D., Principal and Professor of Old Testament Language and Literature, College of Presbyterian Church of England, Cambridge, England. [*Now Ready.*

EXODUS. The Rev. A. R. S. Kennedy, D.D., Professor of Hebrew, University of Edinburgh.

LEVITICUS. J. F. Stenning, M.A., Fellow of Wadham College, Oxford.

NUMBERS. The Rev. G. Buchanan Gray, D.D., Professor of Hebrew, Mansfield College, Oxford. [*Now Ready.*

DEUTERONOMY. The Rev. S. R. Driver, D.D., D.Litt., sometime Regius Professor of Hebrew, Oxford. [*Now Ready.*

JOSHUA. The Rev. George Adam Smith, D.D., LL.D., Principal of the University of Aberdeen.

JUDGES. The Rev. George F. Moore, D.D., LL.D., Professor of Theology, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. [*Now Ready.*

SAMUEL. The Rev. H. P. Smith, D.D., Librarian, Union Theological Seminary, New York. [*Now Ready.*

KINGS. [*Author to be announced.*]

CHRONICLES. The Rev. Edward L. Curtis, D.D., Professor of Hebrew, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. [*Now Ready.*

EZRA AND NEHEMIAH. The Rev. L. W. Batten, Ph.D., D.D., Professor of Old Testament Literature, General Theological Seminary, New York City. [*Now Ready.*

PSALMS. The Rev. Chas. A. Briggs, D.D., D.Litt., sometime Graduate Professor of Theological Encyclopædia and Symbolics, Union Theological Seminary, New York. [*2 vols. Now Ready.*

PROVERBS. The Rev. C. H. Toy, D.D., LL.D., Professor of Hebrew, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. [*Now Ready.*

JOB. The Rev. G. Buchanan Gray, D.D., Professor of Hebrew, Mansfield College, Oxford, and the Rev. S. R. Driver, D.D., D.Litt., sometime Regius Professor of Hebrew, Oxford. [*In Press.*

ISAIAH. Chaps. I–XXVII. The Rev. G. BUCHANAN GRAY, D.D., Professor of Hebrew, Mansfield College, Oxford. [*Now Ready.*

ISAIAH. Chaps. XXVIII–XXXIX. The Rev. G. BUCHANAN GRAY, D.D. Chaps. LX–LXVI. The Rev. A. S. PEAKE, M.A., D.D., Dean of the Theological Faculty of the Victoria University and Professor of Biblical Exegesis in the University of Manchester, England.

JEREMIAH. The Rev. A. F. KIRKPATRICK, D.D., Dean of Ely, sometime Regius Professor of Hebrew, Cambridge, England.

EZEKIEL. The Rev. G. A. COOKE, M.A., Oriel Professor of the Interpretation of Holy Scripture, University of Oxford, and the Rev. CHARLES F. BURNEY, D.Litt., Fellow and Lecturer in Hebrew, St. John's College, Oxford.

DANIEL. The Rev. JOHN P. PETERS, Ph.D., D.D., sometime Professor of Hebrew, P. E. Divinity School, Philadelphia, now Rector of St. Michael's Church, New York City.

AMOS AND HOSEA. W. R. HARPER, Ph.D., LL.D., sometime President of the University of Chicago, Illinois. [*Now Ready.*

MICAH, ZEPHANIAH, NAHUM, HABAKKUK, OBADIAH AND JOEL. Prof. JOHN M. P. SMITH, University of Chicago; W. HAYES WARD, D.D., LL.D., Editor of *The Independent*, New York; Prof. JULIUS A. BEWER, Union Theological Seminary, New York. [*Now Ready.*

HAGGAI, ZECHARIAH, MALACHI AND JONAH. Prof. H. G. MITCHELL, D.D.; Prof. JOHN M. P. SMITH, Ph.D., and Prof. J. A. BEWER, Ph.D. [*Now Ready.*

ESTHER. The Rev. L. B. PATON, Ph.D., Professor of Hebrew, Hartford Theological Seminary. [*Now Ready.*

ECCLESIASTES. Prof. GEORGE A. BARTON, Ph.D., Professor of Biblical Literature, Bryn Mawr College, Pa. [*Now Ready.*

RUTH, SONG OF SONGS AND LAMENTATIONS. Rev. CHARLES A. BRIGGS, D.D., D.Litt., sometime Graduate Professor of Theological Encyclopædia and Symbolics, Union Theological Seminary, New York.

THE NEW TESTAMENT

ST. MATTHEW. The Rev. WILLOUGHBY C. ALLEN, M.A., Fellow and Lecturer in Theology and Hebrew, Exeter College, Oxford. [*Now Ready.*

ST. MARK. Rev. E. P. GOULD, D.D., sometime Professor of New Testament Literature, P. E. Divinity School, Philadelphia. [*Now Ready.*

ST. LUKE. The Rev. ALFRED PLUMMER, D.D., late Master of University College, Durham. [*Now Ready.*

ST. JOHN. The Right Rev. JOHN HENRY BERNARD, D.D., Bishop of Ossory, Ireland.

HARMONY OF THE GOSPELS. The Rev. WILLIAM SANDAY, D.D., LL.D., Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity, Oxford, and the Rev. WILLOUGHBY C. ALLEN, M.A., Fellow and Lecturer in Divinity and Hebrew, Exeter College, Oxford.

ACTS. The Rev. C. H. TURNER, D.D., Fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford, and the Rev. H. N. BATE, M.A., Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of London.

ROMANS. The Rev. WILLIAM SANDAY, D.D., LL.D., Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity and Canon of Christ Church, Oxford, and the Rev. A. C. HEADLAM, M.A., D.D., Principal of King's College, London. [*Now Ready.*

I. CORINTHIANS. The Right Rev. ARCH ROBERTSON, D.D., LL.D., Lord Bishop of Exeter, and Rev. ALFRED PLUMMER, D.D., late Master of University College, Durham. [*Now Ready.*

II. CORINTHIANS. The Rev. ALFRED PLUMMER, M.A., D.D., late Master of University College, Durham. [*Now Ready.*

GALATIANS. The Rev. ERNEST D. BURTON, D.D., Professor of New Testament Literature, University of Chicago. [*Now Ready.*

EPHESIANS AND COLOSSIANS. The Rev. T. K. ABBOTT, B.D., D.Litt., sometime Professor of Biblical Greek, Trinity College, Dublin, now Librarian of the same. [*Now Ready.*

PHILIPPIANS AND PHILEMON. The Rev. MARVIN R. VINCENT, D.D., Professor of Biblical Literature, Union Theological Seminary, New York City. [*Now Ready.*

THESSALONIANS. The Rev. JAMES E. FRAME, M.A., Professor of Biblical Theology, Union Theological Seminary, New York City. [*Now Ready.*

THE PASTORAL EPISTLES. The Rev. WALTER LOCK, D.D., Warden of Keble College and Professor of Exegesis, Oxford.

HEBREWS. The Rev. JAMES MOFFATT, D.D., Minister United Free Church, Broughty Ferry, Scotland.

ST. JAMES. The Rev. JAMES H. ROPES, D.D., Bussey Professor of New Testament Criticism in Harvard University. [*Now Ready.*

PETER AND JUDE. The Rev. CHARLES BIGG, D.D., sometime Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History and Canon of Christ Church, Oxford. [*Now Ready.*

THE JOHANNINE EPISTLES. The Rev. E. A. BROOKE, B.D., Fellow and Divinity Lecturer in King's College, Cambridge. [*Now Ready.*

REVELATION. The Rev. ROBERT H. CHARLES, M.A., D.D., sometime Professor of Biblical Greek in the University of Dublin. [*2 vols. Now Ready.*

The International Theological Library

ARRANGEMENT OF VOLUMES AND AUTHORS

THEOLOGICAL ENCYCLOPÆDIA. By CHARLES A. BRIGGS, D.D., D.Litt., sometime Professor of Theological Encyclopædia and Symbolics, Union Theological Seminary, New York.

AN INTRODUCTION TO THE LITERATURE OF THE OLD TESTAMENT. By S. R. DRIVER, D.D., D.Litt., sometime Regius Professor of Hebrew and Canon of Christ Church, Oxford.
[*Revised and Enlarged Edition.*

CANON AND TEXT OF THE OLD TESTAMENT. By the Rev. JOHN SKINNER, D.D., Principal and Professor of Old Testament Language and Literature, College of the Presbyterian Church of England, Cambridge, England, and the Rev. OWEN WHITEHOUSE, B.A., Principal and Professor of Hebrew, Chestnut College, Cambridge, England.

OLD TESTAMENT HISTORY. By HENRY PRESERVED SMITH, D.D., Librarian, Union Theological Seminary, New York. [*Now Ready.*

THEOLOGY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT. By A. B. DAVIDSON, D.D., LL.D., sometime Professor of Hebrew, New College, Edinburgh.
[*Now Ready.*

AN INTRODUCTION TO THE LITERATURE OF THE NEW TESTAMENT. By Rev. JAMES MOFFATT, B.D., Minister United Free Church, Broughty Ferry, Scotland. [*Revised Edition.*

CANON AND TEXT OF THE NEW TESTAMENT. By CASPAR RENÉ GREGORY, D.D., LL.D., sometime Professor of New Testament Exegesis in the University of Leipsig. [*Now Ready.*

A HISTORY OF CHRISTIANITY IN THE APOSTOLIC AGE. By ARTHUR C. MCGIFFERT, D.D., President Union Theological Seminary, New York. [*Now Ready.*

CONTEMPORARY HISTORY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT. By FRANK C. PORTER, D.D., Professor of Biblical Theology, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.

THEOLOGY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT. By GEORGE B. STEVENS, D.D., sometime Professor of Systematic Theology, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. [*Now Ready.*

BIBLICAL ARCHÆOLOGY. By G. BUCHANAN GRAY, D.D., Professor of Hebrew, Mansfield College, Oxford.

THE ANCIENT CATHOLIC CHURCH. By ROBERT RAINEY, D.D., LL.D., sometime Principal of New College, Edinburgh. [*Now Ready.*

THE LATIN CHURCH IN THE MIDDLE AGES. By ANDRE LAGARDE. [*Now Ready.*

THE GREEK AND EASTERN CHURCHES. By W. F. ADENEY, D.D., Principal of Independent College, Manchester. [*Now Ready.*

THE REFORMATION IN GERMANY. By T. M. LINDSAY, D.D., Principal of the United Free College, Glasgow. [*Now Ready.*

THE REFORMATION IN LANDS BEYOND GERMANY. By T. M. LINDSAY, D.D. [*Now Ready.*

THEOLOGICAL SYMBOLICS. By CHARLES A. BRIGGS, D.D., D.Litt., sometime Professor of Theological Encyclopædia and Symbolics, Union Theological Seminary, New York. [*Now Ready.*

HISTORY OF CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE. By G. P. FISHER, D.D., LL.D., sometime Professor of Ecclesiastical History, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. [*Revised and Enlarged Edition.*

CHRISTIAN INSTITUTIONS. By A. V. G. ALLEN, D.D., sometime Professor of Ecclesiastical History, Protestant Episcopal Divinity School, Cambridge, Mass. [*Now Ready.*

PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION. By GEORGE GALLOWAY, D.D., Minister of United Free Church, Castle Douglas, Scotland. [*Now Ready.*

HISTORY OF RELIGIONS. I. China, Japan, Egypt, Babylonia, Assyria, India, Persia, Greece, Rome. By GEORGE F. MOORE, D.D., LL.D., Professor in Harvard University. [*Now Ready.*

HISTORY OF RELIGIONS. II. Judaism, Christianity, Mohammedanism. By GEORGE F. MOORE, D.D., LL.D., Professor in Harvard University. [*Now Ready.*

APOLOGETICS. By A. B. BRUCE, D.D., sometime Professor of New Testament Exegesis, Free Church College, Glasgow. [*Revised and Enlarged Edition.*